DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 120 UD 013 656

AUTHOR	Grigg, Charles M.; And Others
TITLE	Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Public Assistance Clients: A Follow up Study of Four Projects.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Inst. for Social Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	103p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Employment Problems; *Employment Programs; Health Services; Income; *Physically Handicapped; *Poverty Programs; Program Evaluation; Rehabilitation Counseling; Rehabilitation Programs; Research Methodology; Social Welfare; Unemployment; *Vocational Rehabilitation; Welfare; *Welfare Recipients

ABSTRACT

The present report is a follow up study of disabled public assistance clients in four States. It attempts to evaluate the effects of cooperative efforts--between personnel of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Division of Family Services--to intervene in the poverty/dependence cycle of selected disabled welfare applicants and/or recipients. Between the years of 1963 and 1967 the Federal office of Vocational Rehabilitation provided funding for a total of 27 Research and Demonstration projects for the purpose of exploring ways and means for vocationally rehabilitating disabled welfare recipients and/or applicants. The major or primary goal of each project--and this is perhaps worth emphasizing--was to intervene in the poverty/dependence cycle characterizing many recipients of public assistance and, by provision of intensive health and rehabilitative services, to enable them to embark on economically independent and productive careers. Active participation in the country's labor market and consequent independence from public assistance grants were primary project goals--and thus among the primary evaluative criteria of the projects' effects. A second goal of the projects was to complete and analyze project data on the recipients and on the kinds, results, and costs of services provided to them. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078120

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR DISABLED PUBLIC ASSISTANCE CLIENTS: A FOLLOW UP STUDY OF FOUR PROJECTS

Charles M. Grigg, Director
Institute for Social Research

Patricia Y. Martin
Assistant Professor
School of Social Welfare and
Research Associate
Institute for Social Research

Michael G. Horton
Research Associate
Institute for Social Research

Marie W. Osmond
Research Associate
Institute for Social Research

Institute for Social Research
Florida State University
Bellamy Building
Tallahassee, Florida
1972

UD 013656

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with deep gratitude to a great number of people that we have been successful in completing this follow-up study. As noted in the text of the report, our goals included agency data from both Vocational Rehabilitation and Public Welfare in seven counties of four states. This was in addition to the search for 1,411 clients and the successful interview of a total of 861. The authors wish to recognize the services of the 150 interviewers who helped locate and interview our target sample.

Further, we express great appreciation to the state, district and county Administrators and Directors of the Vocational Rehabilitation and Public Welfare programs of whose data and clients we requested access. In all instances, we received their cooperation and support. Specifically, we wish to recognize the following persons for their generous assistance. By state, and in alphabetical order, they are:

Arkansas

Mr. William S. Andrews, Director
Pulaski County Public Welfare Department
Mr. W. H. Baldwin, Counselor
Vocational Rehabilitation District Office
Ms. Shirley Rollans, Pulaski Project Supervisor
Pulaski County Public Welfare Department

Florida

Ms. Janis J. Cole, Assistant Administrator
Division of Family Services, District 12
Ms. Betty Earle, Orlando Seminole Project Supervisor
Vocational Rehabilitation,
Mr. Earle,
Vocational Rehabilitation

New Jersey

Ms. Florence Rothenberg, Social Worker
Monmouth County, Public Welfare Department
Mr. Leo L. Selling, District Supervisor
Vocational Rehabilitation, Essex County
Ms. Harriett Stone, Social Worker
Union County, Public Welfare Department

West Virginia

Mr. Virgil Conrad, Assistant Commissioner
West Virginia Department of Public Welfare
Ms. Fayelda B. Griffith, Counselor/Administrator
Vocational Rehabilitation, District Office
Mr. John B. Hover, Kanawha Project Supervisor
Kanawha County Community Action Program

On the staff of the Institute for Social Research, appreciation is expressed to all the persons who assisted us in the data collection, data reduction, and data analysis processes. Specifically, we wish to thank Dr. Glenn G. Loveland for overseeing the data collection effort in the states of Florida and New Jersey. Ms. Kay Olesen, Mr. Nelson Easterling, and Mr. Richard Matus helped us immensely with the data-coding and data reduction processes. And, for invaluable assistance with computer programming, we heartily thnk Ms. Adele Spielberger and Ms. Daryl Nall.

Special thanks goes also to the typing and administrative staff, Ms. Mary Sperling, Ms. Ann Fountain, Ms. Randa Vernon, Ms. Debbie Lamb and Ms. Margaret Williams, for their assistance in the final preporation of the report.

Support for this project was provided by Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education and Welfare under VR-PA number RD-1323-G.

Charles M. Grigg
Patricia Y. Martin
Michael C. Horton
Marie W. Osmond

Tallahassee, Florida
September 27, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	List of Tables	vi
	Summary of Findings	ix
Chapter One	Introduction and Overview	1
	Overview of the Original and Follow Up Studies	2
Chapter Two	Research Methodology of the Original and Follow Up Surveys and Description of the Interviewed Sample	7
	Methodology of the Follow Up Study	8
	Securement, Training and Supervision of Interviewers	9
	Success of the Effort to Locate and Interview Clients	9
	Outcome of Client Search - A Comparison of Respondents VS Non-Respondents	11
	Search Outcome and Closure Status	11
	Search Outcome by Race and Sex	13
	Search Outcome and Age	
	Search Outcome and Education	
	Search Outcome and Former Occupation	
	Search Outcome and Type of Public Assistance at Project Opening	14
	Search Outcome and Type of Disability	14
	Search Outcome by Project	15
	Summary of Search Outcome	15
	Success of Effort to Obtain Public Assistance Data From Welfare Agencies	15
	A Descriptive Overview of the Interviewed Clients	19
Chapter Three	Services Provided, Services Perceived	28
	Involvment of Counselors and Caseworkers at the Referral Stage	28
	Agency Provided Service for Those Participating in the Joint Program	30
	Delivery of Agency Service as Perceived by the Client	33
	Evaluation of Services Offered	35
	Evaluation of Most Helpful Service Rendered by the Two Agencies	38
	Summary	40
Chapter Four	The Clients' Welfare Chronology: Assessment of Joint Program Through Agency Obtained Data on Public Assistance	43
	A Review of the Agency Reported Data	44
	Effectiveness of Joint Program as Revealed by Public Assistance Records	45

	Change in Type of Public Assistance	47
	Public Assistance Status as of July 1, 1969	49
	Public Assistance Status at Time of Interview	50
	Public Assistance Payments as of July 31	52
	Summary	53
Chapter Five	Major Sources of Income	55
	Proportion Per Capita Income Due to Earnings by Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex	59
	Proportion of Total Per Capita Income Due to Earnings by Rehabilitation Outcome, Sex and Race	60
Chapter Six	Income on Last or Present Job	64
	Work History Since Closure or Rejection	70
	Work History Controlling for Closure Status and Sex	72
	Work History Controlling for Closure Status, Sex and Race	74
Chapter Seven	Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview	78
	Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview by Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex	79
	Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview by Rehabilitation Outcome, Sex and Race	83
	Summary	86
Chapter Eight	Summary and Conclusion	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		Page Number
1.	Outcome of the Client-Search in Four Projects.....	10
2.	Interview Search Outcome By Project Closure Status.....	12
3.	Public Assistance Status As of July 31, 1969, By Project Closure Status For 1,411 Clients On Whom PA Data Were Requested.....	17
4.	Interview Outcome By Project Closure Status Controlling for Whether Public Assistance Data Were Obtained.....	18
5.	A Description of the Interviewed Sample On Several Variables, In Percentages (N=861).....	19-20
6.	Means and Standard Deviations On Severity of Disability, Occupational Status (of Present or Last Job), Age, Educational Index, and Total Number in the Home For Each Closure Status Group...	24
7.	Percentage Distribution of Interviews with VR Counselors During Referral Process By Rehabilitation Outcome.....	29
8.	Percentage of CR and CNR Clients Receiving Interviews With VR Counselors During Project.....	30
9.	Percentages of Clients Receiving VR Services During The Projects -- At Cost or At No Cost By Closure Status.....	31
10.	Percentage of CR and CNR Clients Who Received Public Welfare Services During Project.....	33
11.	Percentage Distribution By Agency and Closure Status Of Clients Perception of Services Received.....	34
12.	Percentage Distribution By Agency and Closure Status Of Rating of Helpful of Services Received.....	36

13. Percentage Distribution of VR Services Which Were Thought Most Helpful By Client By Closure Status..... 39

14. Percentage Distribution of Public Welfare Services Which Were Thought Most Helpful By Client By Closure Status..... 39

15. Average Number of Years, Average Number of Weeks Per Year on Public Assistance, and average Number of Applications and Approvals Per Year Since Project Closure for Those Receiving Service by Closure Status and for Those Not Receiving Services..... 45

16. (Percent Distribution) Whether Applicants had a Secondary Disability at Referral by Rehabilitation Outcome.. 48

17. Percent Distribution of Number of Years Since Client Worked Full-Time (at Referral) by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 48

18. Public Assistance Status as of July 1, 1969 by Rehabilitation Outcome and Closure Status..... 49

19. Percent Distribution of Type of Public Assistance Received at Time of Interview by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 51

20. Average Amount of Public Assistance Payments as of July 31, 1969 by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 52

21. Percentage Distribution of Main Source of Support by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 56

22. Percentage Distribution of Per Capita Income From All Sources by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 57

23. Percentage Distribution of Per Capita Income Due to Earnings by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 58

24. Percentage of Total Per Capita Due to Earnings by Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex..... 60

25. Percentage Distribution of Per Capita Income Due to Earnings for Those Receiving Service by Sex and Race..... 61

26. Percentage Distribution of Per Capita Income Due to Earnings for Those Not Receiving Service by Sex and Race..... 63

27. Income on Last or Present Job by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 64

28. Average Weekly Income on Present or Last Job by Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex..... 66

29. Average Weekly Income on Last or Present Job for Closed Rehabilitated by Sex and Race..... 68

30. Average Weekly Income From Last or Present Job for Those Not Rehabilitated by Sex and Race..... 69

31. Average Weekly Income on Last or Present Job for Those Who Did Not Receive Service by Sex and Race.... 70

32. Average Weeks Worked Per Year and Average Weeks on Public Assistance Per Year by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 72

33. Average Weeks Worked and Average Weeks on Public Assistance Per Year by Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex..... 73

34. Average Weeks Worked Per Year and Average Weeks on Public Assistance by Closure Status, Sex and Race..... 75

35. Average Weeks Worked Per Year and Average Weeks on Public Assistance for Those Not Receiving Service,by Sex and Race..... 76

36. Average Income at Time of Interview by Rehabilitation Outcome..... 78

37. Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview By Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex..... 80

38. Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview by Closure Status and Sex..... 82

39. Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview for Those Who Did Not Receive Services by Sex..... 82

40. Average Weekly Income by Rehabilitation Outcome, Sex and Race..... 85

41. Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview for Those Who Received Service by Closure Status, Sex and Race..... 86

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Specific findings of the study are presented below. The reader is encouraged to consult later sections of the report for fuller analysis.

Services Provided

1. At the referral stage, the more personal involvement that professionals had with the potential client the greater the chances were that he or she would be accepted in the program.

2. The greater the personal involvement of the professional staff, as indicated by number of client interviews during the project, the greater the possibility for successful rehabilitation.

3. There was a direct relationship between the number of counseling interviews and the chances for successful rehabilitation. Also there existed a direct relationship between the number of different services provided and the chances for a successful rehabilitation. This finding was especially true for services which involved health or physical restoration and/or job training or related services.

4. The single type of service received by most of the clients was interviews with the vocational rehabilitation personnel including direct interviews with the client as well as with the client's family, employers and/or other placement sources.

5. The services provided during the project by vocational rehabilitation which increased the chances of a successful rehabilitation were health and/or job training.

6. The services provided by public assistance had no observal affect on the clients' chances for successful rehabilitation.

7. With regard to the Public Assistance case workers, both the closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated rated help with financial problems as being the most beneficial service provided by the agency.

Services Perceived

1. As perceived by the client, the services vocational rehabilitation provided more effectively and most frequently were arranging for medical services and general counseling of the client.

2. As perceived by the client, the services public assistance provided most effectively and most frequently were providing help for financial problems and general counseling of the client.

3. In the clients' perceptions, arranging for medical services was the most helpful service rendered by Vocational Rehabilitation counselors.

4. The client perceived that the most helpful service rendered by Public Assistance case workers was furnishing financial aid and assistance.

Assessment of Joint Program Through Agency Obtained Data on Public Assistance

1. According to the figures derived from public welfare records, 36.5 percent of the 1,064 clients in the sample were receiving public assistance payments as of July 31, 1969.

2. The average length of time covered by these records was 44 months. During this period the clients had been on public assistance an average of 19 weeks per year.

3. One out of every seven made an application per year with only one out of every ten being approved.

4. In reviewing the records it was found that 424 clients out of the 1,064 had never received public assistance since closure.

5. It was found that for those who had been accepted for service had a welfare history of 20 weeks per year on public assistance as compared to 22 weeks per year for those applicants who had not been accepted in the joint program.

6. There is a difference of nine weeks in the average number of weeks per year on public assistance between those closed rehabilitated (15) and those closed not rehabilitated (24).

7. Although the time spent on public assistance favors those who have received services (closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated), the difference is more important when it is realized that the group receiving service had 60 percent with secondary disability as compared to 36 percent of those not receiving services.

8. If the proportion with a high severity of disability and an unfavorable work history prior to referrals is taken into account, the lower average time on public assistance since closure indicates that those receiving service were among the most disabled and least prepared in terms of work history prior to referral than were those who did not receive service.

9. There is little evidence to suggest there was a change in the type of public assistance other than the change from recipient to non-recipient, and vice versa.

10. At the time of interview approximately one out of five clients on public assistance were chronic disability cases receiving APTD and would not be eligible for employment.

11. According to the public assistance records, the average amount of payment received by the clients from public assistance as of July 31, 1969 was $36.44; for those closed not rehabilitated the amount was $56.12.

12. The amount of public assistance funding is mainly due to the level of funding in the state of residence. In the absence of a uniform basis for funding for recipients of public assistance the differential in funding can be as much as twice as much from one state to another.

Major Sources of Income

1. Twenty-nine percent of the 861 individuals indicated that their major source of income was from their own earnings.

2. When we look at major source of income by those who received service (closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated) and those who did not receive service, we find that 42 percent of those who received service listed their major source of income as their own earnings or family earnings as compared to 38 percent of those who did not receive service.

3. The range to total family income from all sources is relatively limited. In the entire sample of 861, the mean or average per capita annual income from all sources was $985.00.

4. This distribution of income is highly skewed with 52 percent receiving less than $800 per year from all sources.

5. Distribution of family income from all sources by rehabilitation outcome indicates those receiving services had a mean per capita income of $1,021 as compared to $917 for those who did not receive services.

6. Distribution of per capita income from all sources indicates a very low level of subsistence for the majority of this population. For the entire sample, 66 percent have a per capita income from all sources of less than $1,000 per year with only 3 percent having an income from all sources over $3,000 per year.

7. The distribution of per capita income from all sources also shows that of those who received services, 63.7 percent lived on less than $1,000 per year as compared to 69.4 percent of those who had not received services.

8. In this population the dependency on public assistance as a source of income is very great. In the entire sample, 55 percent were totally dependent on public assistance or some other non-earned income. On the other hand, some 32 percent, or approximately one-third of the 861, indicated that all of their income came from earnings.

9. Dependency on public assistance as a source of income was slightly less for those who receive services (54%) than for those who did not receive services (56%).

10. The least dependent of all the categories were those who received services and were successfully rehabilitated. In this group 45 percent were totally dependent on income other than earnings with 42 percent totally independent of public assistance or other non-earned sources of income.

11. The most dependent of all categories were those who received services but were closed not rehabilitated. In this group 74 percent were totally dependent on public assistance, only 14% were totally dependent upon earnings.

12. When we looked for rehabilitation outcome with sex and race controlled, by total per capita income due to earnings, it was found that the white females who were closed rehabilitated had increased from 35 for all females to 38 percent who earned 100 percent of their income as contrasted to 29 percent for the black females.

13. There were sufficient differences (13 to 24 percentage for females and 35 to 24 percentage points for males) when we controlled for sex and race to indicate different patterns of earnings which, although basically related to closure status, do reflect an interaction between sex, race, closure status and percent whose earnings were their major source of support.

Income on Last or Present Job

1. The average weekly earnings on last or present job since closure or rejection was $60.02. This sample included all persons working at the time of interview or who had worked at least some since closure.

2. During this period 494 or the 861 in the sample, or 57.3 percent, had worked at some time since closure or rejection.

3. The average weekly earnings of those presently working or on last jobs since closure by rehabilitation outcome (closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated) was $64.32. Those who did not receive services reported an average weekly income of $50.28.

4. A $15 differential per week in average income favoring those who had received service was reported.

5. Within the category of those who had received service the closed rehabilitated had the most favorable work experience with 69.1 percent presently working or having worked at some time since closure, with an average weekly income of $67.04. The closed not rehabilitated category reported 32.5 percent had worked at some time during this period with an average weekly income of $57.53.

6. When we controlled for sex, there was little difference by sex in proportion in the sample who had ever worked during this period.

7. A sex difference does appear, however, at this level of analysis in the average weekly earnings as in the case of the females who reported earnings of $44.60 per week as compared to $78 for the males.

8. The sex differential is not consistent when we look at average weekly income on present or last job of rehabilitation outcome. Among those who

received service (closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated) 60 percent of the males had worked or were working since closure as compared to 54.6% of the females. The sex differential here in terms of average weekly income favors the male who reported an average weekly earning of $79.91 as compared to $48.36 for the female. Among those who did not receive service an interesting reversal takes place in that 62.3 percent of the females reported that they had worked some time since closure, and only 49.1 percent of the males reported this. On the other hand, the females had an average income of only $40.00 as compared to $72.40 for the males. Both the males and females who receive services received a higher weekly income than did the females and males who did not receive services.

9. The analysis by closure status within the group who received service indicates the closed rehabilitated group was in the most favorable position at this particular time. They not only had a higher proportion of both males and females employed but their average weekly wages were higher than for any other category. As an indicator of achievement of the program, the 77.5 percent of the males closed rehabilitated who were working is very favorable, and their average weekly earnings of $83.04 is the highest of any category. Among the females who were closed rehabilitated, 62 percent were working with an average weekly income of $50.29, this was the highest average weekly wage of any female category.

10. When the control variable of race was added to sex, additional differentials emerged. Among those who received services were closed as rehabilitated, average income for the white males was $87.26 per week with 77.2 percent having worked during this period, as contrasted to the black males with 78 percent having worked with an average income of $27.77. Among the females who were closed rehabilitated 76.7 percent of the black females reported an average weekly income of $44.67 on their last or present job. Among the white females 51.7 percent had worked during this period with an average income of $56.70.

11. The sex differentials in earnings among the closed rehabilitated is very great. This differential holds among both blacks and whites in that the differential between the black males and females is $28.10 per week, favoring the male. Among the whites the differential is $30.56, favoring the male.

12. The group who did not receive services is quite comparable to the closed rehabilitated group in a average weekly income for the males but is much lower in average weekly income for the females.

13. The 494 in our sample who had ever worked since closure or rejection averaged 29 weeks per year. This same group supplemented their average weeks worked with an average of 15.4 weeks per year on public assistance. This adds up to approximately 44 weeks per year that these

494 clients were receiving either public assistance or an earned income giving a ratio of weeks worked to weeks on public assistance of two to one.

14. Work history by rehabilitation outcome indicates that those who received service worked an average of 30 weeks out of the year. This was supplemented by an average of 13.9 weeks per year on public assistance which gives a ratio of two weeks work to every week on public assistance. This is compared with those who did not receive service who had an average number of weeks worked per year of 28 supplemented by 18.2 weeks per year on public assistance which yielded a ratio of 1.5 weeks worked for every week on public assistance.

15. The closed rehabilitated were the most successful among those who received services. This group reported that they had worked an average of 32.1 weeks per year supplementing this with an average of 12.8 weeks per year on public assistance giving a ratio of weeks worked to weeks on public assistance of 2.5. The closed not rehabilitated reported an average number of weeks worked at 22 with 19.3 weeks supplemented on public assistance giving a ratio of 1.2 weeks worked for every week on public assistance.

16. The females in this sample of 494 who had worked at some point from closure to time of interview reported an average number of weeks at 28.5 per year supplemented by 18.5 weeks on public assistance, representing a ratio of 1.5 weeks worked for every week on public assistance. This is in comparison with males who worked an average of 30.8 weeks per year supplemented by 11.8 weeks per year on public assistance which gave a ratio of 2.6 weeks worked for every week on public assistance.

17. Rehabilitation outcome and average weeks per year worked, with sex controlled, point up the favorable position of males in both the received services and did not receive services group, that is, the males worked slightly more weeks per year than the females, whether or not they received services. The males who did receive services reported an average number of weeks worked per year at 30.7 as compared to average weeks worked by males who did not receive services at 31.2. The males who received services supplemented their average number of weeks worked with 12.4 weeks on public assistance as compared to 10.0 weeks for those males who did not receive services.

18. Among the females the pattern was reversed in that those who received services worked more weeks on the average than those who did not receive service. The former reported an average of 29.9 weeks worked per year compared to 26.7 weeks for the females who did not receive service. The females who did not receive service also supplemented this with fewer weeks on public assistance per year 15.7 as compared to 21.9 weeks per year on supplemental income of those who did not receive service.

19. Among those who were receiving services and were successfully rehabilitated, the males worked, on the average, 34 weeks per year and

were on public assistance 10.9 weeks (a ratio of 3.1 weeks for every week on public assistance). This is in contrast to the females who indicated they had worked, on the average, 30.1 weeks and were on public assistance 14.8 weeks per year (a ratio of 2.1 weeks for every week on public assistance).

20. The major finding when we control for both sex and race is the relatively high ratio of average weeks worked to average weeks on public assistance of the white females who indicated that they worked 29.4 weeks per year supplementing it with an average of 7.1 weeks on public assistance (a ratio of 4.1 weeks worked for every week on public assistance). The white males who were rehabilitated increased their ratio to 3.3 weeks worked for every week on public assistance. The other finding was the low ratio of weeks worked to weeks on public assistance of the not rehabilitated white males. They reported an average number of weeks worked of 19.1 as compared to an average number of weeks an public assistance of 20.3 giving a ratio of .9.

21. The main findings when we control for sex and race is that among those who did not receive services, there is a high ratio of weeks worked to weeks on public assistance of the black males (which increased to 3.6) and a relatively low ratio of weeks worked to weeks on public assistance of the black females, which decreased to one week worked for one week on public assistance.

Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview

1. At time of interview there were 322 (or 37 percent of the 861) who were working earned an average weekly income of $63.04.

2. Average income at time of interview by rehabilitation outcome indicates that 36.9 percent of those who received services were working at time of interview earning an average income of $70.06 as compared to 38.3 percent of those who did not receive service and who were earning $55.99 per week.

3. When we looked at this sample of clients who were working at time of interview by sex we found that 39.2 percent of the males were employed at time of interview earning $80.88 as compared to 35.9 percent of the females who were earning an average of $49.98 per week. This represents a differential of $31.00 per week favoring the male. This represents an advantage of 62 percent in average weekly income favoring the male in this population.

4. Rehabilitation outcome and sex reveals a continuation of this dual pattern of earnings in that the males who received service earned an

average weekly income of $84.14 as compared to $52.63 for the female. A similar differential exists among those who did not receive service in that the males received an average weekly income of $72.40 as compared to $46.68 of the females.

5. Closure status within those who received services continues to accentuate the differential due to sex in that those males who received services and were closed rehabilitated reported an average weekly income of $85.31 as compared to $54.30 for the females. The males in the closed rehabilitated group reported the highest percentage working of any group for rehabilitation outcome and closure status and they also have the highest average weekly income.

6. When the third variable, race, is added it continues to accentuate the differences. The most favorable group now is the white males who were rehabilitated report an average weekly income of $88.74 as compared to $73.32 for the black males, $57.78 for the white females and $46.50 for the black females which is the lowest paid group.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The present report is a follow up study of disabled public assistance clients in four states. It attempts to evaluate the effects of cooperative efforts -- between personnel of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Division of Family Services -- to intervene in the poverty/dependence cycle of selected disabled welfare applicants and/ of recipients.

An earlier report, evaluating the immediate benefits and results of fourteen such projects around the nation, indicated that on the whole the intervention projects were quite successful in rehabilitating the clients of public assistance.[1] For example, among the 1,735 public assistance clients who were accepted by Vocational Rehabilitation and whose cases were officially "closed" during the projects operation-periods, 1,146 -- or 66.0 percent -- were closed as rehabilitated. Further, among the 1,146 clients closed as rehabilitated, 78 percent were employed full-time at closure (with 68 percent in the competitive labor market), as opposed to only 4.9 percent full-time at the time of referral to the projects. These, and similar results, would indicate that the projects' efforts were quite successful.

---

[1]See Charles M. Grigg, A. G. Holtman and P. Y. Martin, Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Public Assistance Clients: An Evaluation of Fourteen Projects, Urban Research Center Report No. 8, Institute for Social Research, Tallahassee, Florida, 1969. Also, see Vocational Rehabilitation for the Disadvantaged, Lexington, Massachusetts, D. C. Heath, 1970.

Overview of the Original and Follow-up Studies:

Between the years of 1963 and 1967 the federal office of Vocational Rehabilitation (OVA, now a division of Social and Rehabilitative services in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare) provided funding for a total of twenty-seven Research and Demonstration (R&D) projects for the purpose of exploring ways and means for vocationally rehabilitating disabled welfare recipients and/or applicants. Since the purposes, goals and scope of these projects have been summarized elsewhere, (Grigg, et al., 1969; Kramm, 1970) mention will be made here only of two specific goals. The major or primary goal of each project -- and this is perhaps worth emphasizing -- was to intervene in the poverty/dependence cycle characterizing many recipients of public assistance and, by provision of intensive health and rehabilitative services, to enable them to embark on economically independent and productive careers. Active participation in the country's labor market and consequent independence from public assistance grants were primary project goals -- and thus among the primary evaluative criteria of the projects' effects (see the Grigg, et al. report, 1969; particularly Chapters VI through IX economic benefits of vocational rehabilitation). A second goal of the projects, as specified by the OVA guidelines, was to complete and analyze project data on the recipients and on the kinds, results and costs of services provided to them.

With the above goals in mind, staff of the Institute for Social Research, The Florida State University (supported by an OVR grant), garnered complete data on client characteristics, services and project outcomes from fourteen of the twenty-seven R and D projects. The results of the analysis of these data were published in

a monograph in early 1969 (Grigg, et al.). In brief, data were analyzed for 7,694 persons referred by public assistance to vocational rehabilitation agencies. Of these referrals, 2,786 (or 36 percent) were accepted by VR for services, and of the total number accepted, 1,146 (or 44 percent) were closed as rehabilitated. Analysis of the data on clients and services focused on the factors related to a successful rehabilitation outcome, including client physical disabilities and demographic characteristics as well as quantity and type of agency services provided for the clients. Further, the data were analyzed in a cost-benefit framework with results specifying the average costs to the projects of clients closed as rehabilitated versus not rehabilitated, and also estimating the average reduction in monthly welfare payments ($47.95) for an average client in the projects (also, see Levine, 1970).

The follow-up study of four of the original projects has, as its major objective, an understanding of the social and economic conditions of the clients who received services under this program. The re-study of these clients took place from two to four years after closure of the cases. In one sense, it is a microcrasm of the entire process since we included, all persons referred to these four programs, for service and a sample of the remainder. The basic question is whether the services provided broke the cycle of dependency on welfare and whether the programs make any impact on income levels.

Data was obtained from three basic sources: First, the data gathered in the original study was used; second, a search of public welfare records for a five-year period gave us a picture through

time of their welfare history; and the third source was the interview itself.

The target population for the re-study was all applicants for public assistance referred to the joint screening committee of counselors and caseworkers in each of four states. The four states were Arkansas (Pulaski County), Florida (Orange and Seminole Counties), New Jersey (Essex, Manmouth, and Union Counties), and West Virginia (Kanawka County). These particular projects were selected so as to provide a sample from the original study of applicants for public assistance who would be representative of the population. Criteria on which the selection of projects was based were as follows: sex, race, rural-urban balance, and a variety of categories of public assistance applicants (for example, including applicants and/or recipients of AFDC, APTD, OAA, MAA and so forth.)

The research design and analysis centered around three sources of data: First, the use of existing data from the original study including information Sheet 1, which was completed on all applicants for public assistance who were referred to the program; Data Sheet 2, which was completed on all those who were accepted into the program and who received services. The second source of information was the chronological welfare obtained from the case records of the Division of Family Services Agencies; and third was the personal interview obtained on all applicants to the original program.

As for the applicants to be individually interviewed, three categories were specified. In each of the four projects (in four states), they were as follows: (1) all applicants who were accepted

for project services and who were later closed as rehabilitated or not rehabilitated (including those clients previously denoted as "project actives"); (2) all applicants who were referred for VR services and accepted by the agency but who voluntarily declined the projects' offer of services; and (3) a ten percent sample of all other applicants considered for project services but who were denied them on the basis of project selection criteria.

A concerted effort was made to locate and interview a total of 1,411 project subjects. Of this number, 103, or 7.3 percent, were found to be deceased; thus, of the remaining 1,308 clients, 861, or 65.8 percent, were located and interviewed. Regarding the chronological public assistance history on each person in the sample, data from Public Welfare were secured on 1,152 of 1,411 clients, or 81.6 percent; or, if one excludes the 103 deceased clients, the percentage of subjects on whom welfare agency data were obtained becomes 88.0 percent.

The sample includes four groups of applicants: (1) those accepted for services and closed rehabilitated, (2) those accepted for services and closed not rehabilitated, (3) those who voluntarily declined services, and (4) those who did not meet the guidelines of the project. The analysis will include the following: (1) a comparison of the interviewed clients with those clients in the target population who were not interviewed; (2) an analysis of the services provided those who participated in the program, along with the clients' perceptions of the most valuable services provided by both agencies; (3) an analysis of the public assistance history of the client from closure or rejection to time of interview; and (4) an evaluation of

total family income of those clients interviewed by rehabilitation outcome. Rehabilitation outcome divides the target population into two groups: those receiving service, which includes those closed rehabilitated and those closed not rehabilitated; and those not receiving service. The latter group includes those who voluntarily refused to participate plus those who did not meet the criteria; (5) an evaluation of income patterns of the interviewed clients on their last or present job, as well as a summary of work history, proportion of year worked related to proportion of year supplemented by public assistance; (6) finally, an analysis of income of those who were working at time of interview. Both of the last two analyses will include comparison by rehabilitation outcome sex and race.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OF THE ORIGINAL AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEYS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEWED SAMPLE

Introduction

The research design for the original and follow-up surveys differed in two basic respects: First, in the original study, the data for evaluation of the projects were gathered by agency personnel, of both VR and PW, in accord with federally designed and supplied DATA I and II sheets (see Appendix). In the follow-up, although a considerable quantity of agency data was requested (and the DATA I and II sheets were utilized for gathering information on the "project actives"), personnel for gathering the data were hired and trained by the Institute for Social Research. Thus, no hardships were imposed on agency personnel in the latter data-gathering process, and one may assume that the likelihood of "vested interest" was less apt to influence reported results than in the original project.

The second major difference between the original and follow-up research designs is that, in the latter, personal interviews with the project clients were secured. This seemed desirable for several reasons: One, it allowed the clients to speak for themselves by providing an opportunity for them to react to the projects' services, procedures, and personnal; two, it allowed for the securement of data on the rather personal level--regarding family conflict, childrens' problems, as well as attitudinal data.

Methodology of the Follow-Up Study:

As noted previously, the goal of the follow-up survey of clients in four of the VR-PW projects was to assess the effects of the projects after a period of two to five years. Specifically, it was hoped that assessment could be made of the projects' influence on client employment, family stability, self-esteem, dependency on public assistance and so forth.

Construction of the interview schedule for collecting data from the individual clients was facilitated by requesting (and receiving) interview and questionnaire forms from investigators across the country who were interested and experienced in research on vocational rehabilitation, public welfare, and the hard-core unemployed. Four versions of the schedule were constructed before the final one was deemed satisfactory. After the third form was completed, a pre-test on approximately twenty sample clients revealed that (1) several of our instructions to interviewers were unclear and (2) much of our vocabulary and phrasing was too sophisticated (and/or abstract) for the clients' comprehension. Thus, on revision and re-wording, we succeeded in devising a usable thirty-five page schedule which required forty-five minutes to an hour to administer.

While the interview schedule was under construction, the effort to locate accurate client addresses was also underway. The process was begun by securing the last known address for the clients from each of the four VR agencies; then, post-offices in every city or town were written requesting address verification. This proved

somewhat successful--with the addresses of about thirty percent of the clients being confirmed. Next, the project staff turned to city and county directories, telephone companies, utility companies, and retail credit agencies who added considerably to the lists of verifications. In the end, however, interviewer detective work--searching on an hourly-wage basis--was resorted to for locating and/or at least looking for many of the clients in the sample.

Securement, Training and Supervision of Interviewers:

Interviewers were recruited at the local level in each of the seven counties involved in the follow-up.[3] Generally, the process was begun by requesting volunteers from the local welfare and rehabilitation agencies, nearby college and/or universities, and other social service agencies (e.g., the Community Action Program in Charleston, West Virginia), and so on. From among those interested, a local project supervisor was selected, which in two instances was a social caseworker, and in two others, individuals who were not otherwise employed. A training manual of 18 pages was written and utilized in the three to five hour interviewer-training sessions, during which the manuals were read and discussed and practice interviews were conducted.

Success of the Effort to Locate and Interview Clients:

The results of the client interview-search are shown in Table 1. This Table presents the total number of clients sought who were located and interviewed and a breakdown of the reasons for "no interview" for

---

[3]In review, there were three counties in New Jersey (Essex, Monmouth, and Union), two in Florida (Seminole and Orange), and one each in Arkansas (Pulaski) and West Virginia (Kanash).

those clients for whom an interview schedule was not completed. It can be seen that the largest category of this type was "moved out of area," with 15.2 percent of the clients falling there; the second most frequent reason for failure to interview was "could not locate," with 9.1 percent. If one assumes that those persons who could not be located, as well as those for whom "no reason was given for failure to interview," had moved out of the area, then it appears that approximately thirty percent of our target population had moved away from the county in which the projects took place.

It was noted earlier that if the total number of deceased clients was subtracted from the target sample to be interviewed, the proportion of clients who were located and interviewed becomes 65.8 percent.

TABLE 1

OUTCOME OF THE CLIENT-SEARCH IN FOUR PROJECTS

Outcome	Number	Percent
Located and interviewed	861	61.0
Moved out of area	215	15.2
Could not locate in any way	128	9.1
Institutionalized (mental hospitals, prisons, etc.)	7	.5
Refused interview	3	.2
Other reasons for no interview	19	1.3
Unable to be interviewed	8	.6
Deceased	103	7.4
No reason given for failure to interview	67	4.7
TOTAL	1,411	100.0

Outcome of Client Search - A Comparison of Respondents vs. Non-Respondents:

Prior to entering the field, a decision was made to not follow-up on those clients who had left the immediate area; this decision eliminated 15 percent of the original population. The average length of time elapsed between the original project and the follow-up was approximately four years and during this period, 7.4 percent of the target population had died. There were seven clients who were institutionalized during this period; if we subtract these from the 1,411, the clients eligible for interview decreased to 1,093. The 861 interviewed represent 70 percent of this population.

Search Outcome and Closure Status: In addition to the two closure statuses , closed, rehabilitated and closed, not rehabilitated, this study used two additional categories: closed from referral, involuntarily and closed from referral, voluntarily. In the first instance, the classification refers to those welfare applicants who did not meet the minimum criteria set for the project and, as such, were declared ineligible to receive the joint services provided for those accepted. In the latter case, closed from referral, voluntarily, these clients were also applicants for public welfare and met the criteria for acceptance into the project, but declined to participate in the program on their own volition.

The marginal percentages in Table 2 of "Outcome of Client Search" are used as a basis of comparison to see if various characteristics of the clients are distributed proportionally over the four closure statuses; the body of Table 2 gives us these comparisons. Among those interviewed, there is under-representation of clients in the closed at referral, involuntarily, with a corresponding over-representation of clients in the closed at referral, voluntarily. There

TABLE 2

INTERVIEW SEARCH OUTCOME BY PROJECT CLOSURE STATUS

Outcome	Closed, Rehabilitated	Closed, not Rehabilitated	Closed at referral, Involuntary	Closed at referral, Voluntary	Total
Located and interviewed	380 (60.9)	178 (60.7)	116 (55.6)	187 (65.6)	861 (61.0)
Moved out of area	102 (16.4)	34 (11.6)	35 (16.7)	44 (15.4)	215 (15.2)
Could not locate	67 (10.7)	16 (5.5)	16 (7.6)	29 (10.2)	128 (9.1)
No information	26 (4.2)	19 (6.5)	11 (5.3)	11 (3.9)	67 (4.7)
Unable	2 (0.3)	3 (1.0)	2 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	7 (0.5)
Institution-alized	1 (0.2)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.2)
Refused	9 (1.4)	4 (1.4)	4 (1.9)	2 (0.7)	19 (1.4)
Other	5 (0.8)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	8 (0.6)
Deceased	32 (5.1)	35 (11.9)	25 (12.0)	11 (3.8)	103 (7.3)
TOTAL	624 (100.0)	293 (100.0)	209 (100.0)	285 (100.0)	1,411 (100.0)

are minor discrepancies in the various categories of "non-interviewed" clients with one exception. This exception is in the category of deceased. The categories "closed not rehabilitated" and "closed at referral, involuntarily" have a disproportionate percentage in the deceased category.

Search Outcome by Race and Sex: The interviewers were more successful in locating the black clients, and more successful in locating black females than males. In the various categories of non-interviewed and non-located, two categories have major discrepancies. Approximately 10 percent of the blacks were reported as having moved out of area, whereas, 20 percent of the white females and 16 percent of the white males have moved out of the area. In the deceased category, the males, particularly black males, have a higher death rate than the females. The death rate for each of these groups is high, another indication of the selective nature of this population. As a basis of comparison within this study, the unadjusted death rate for the white females is 44 per thousand and 54 per thousand for the black females. The highest death rate is found among the black males with a rate of 135 per thousand, with white males next with 82 per thousand. The black males have a death rate three times that of white females and two and one-half times that of black females. These death rates apply for the period of approximately four to eight years (from the interview at the beginning of the project until the search began).

Search Outcome and Age: Among those located, the proportion in each age group, as related to the total sample, varies from an under-representation of 9 percent in the age group 0-19 to an over-representation of 5 percent in the 30-39 year olds. In the non-located categories, there is a disproportionate number in the younger age group, 0-19 years, who have been reported as having moved. It is this age group who also has a disproportionate number in the could not locate category.

Search Outcome and Education: The distribution of education by search outcome does not indicate a great deal of selectivity between those interviewed and those not located. In the moved category, a disproportionate number of persons with no formal education moved, whereas at the upper levels of educational attainment the percentages were lower than expected by the marginals.

Search Outcome and Former Occupation: Search outcome is related to distribution of occupations. In the located category, the classifications of housewife and service are over-represented by 16 percent. The skilled and professional classifications are also under-represented by approximately 10 percent. The pattern here is that the higher level occupations are under-represented whereas the unskilled and housewives are over-represented. In the categories of non-located, housewives and clerical are over-represented in the moved category.

Search Outcome and Type of Public Assistance at Project Opening: A number of the persons in our target population were first-time applicants at the beginning of this project. One of our concerns was whether those not receiving public assistance would be under-represented in our interview sample. There was a small under-representation of this group in our interview sample, but there is very little variation by type of public assistance received at time of opening.

Search Outcome and Type of Disability: There seems to be little variation in the types of disability by search outcome except in the case of arthritis, diabetes, epilepsy, and cardiac. This under-representation can be explained in terms of the high death rate in these groups. In both categories of disability, the death rate is highest in cardiac

group with a rate of 149 per thousand and in the other group the rate is 132 per thousand. In the disability category of pulmontary TB, the rate is as high, but the number is relatively small.

Search Outcome by Project: A summary of the search outcome by state or project reflects the characteristics of the clients who were in the project in terms of age, sex, race, education, and occupation. Florida and New Jersey had the lowest interviewed rate. In the case of Florida, this is reflected in the higher proportioned moved and deceased. In the case of New Jersey, it is reflected in the higher death rate and clients that could not be located. It is of interest that the New Jersey search reported very few clients who were known to have moved outside the area.

Summary of Search Outcome: After reviewing the relationship between the categories of non-interviewed with the interviewed sample on closure status, race and sex, age, occupation, type of public assistance received, type of disability, and project, we find that our interviewed sample is a conservatively biased estimate of the target population. By conservatively biased, we mean that our interviewed sample is older and relatively unskilled. Also, we located and interviewed a greater proportion of blacks, housewives and service workers, and a greater proportion of our interviewed sample came from economically depressed areas, i.e., Arkansas and West Virginia. Consequently, one should bear in mind that the resulting analysis will, for the most part, be conservative estimations of the actual situation.

Success of Effort to Obtain Public Assistance Data from Welfare Agencies:

In each of the four states, letters were mailed to the state and local directors of Public Welfare, explaining our project aims and

requesting the directors' endorsements to obtain welfare history from 1963-69.

After meetings with the various directors of the county welfare, and for the purpose of gaining their approval and assistance, selected persons were identified, trained and hired to conduct the data-gathering process from the agency records. These individuals varied from high school graduates looking for summer employment,to state officials in the agencies involved. With the one exceptional county, from which no welfare data were obtained, the reason for failure to obtain the needed data on the client sample were, for the most part, as follows: (1) either the case records had been destroyed or lost, or (2) the client had moved to another area or state and his record had been forwarded to another area. Partial and/or complete data were obtained from PW on 1,152 or 1,411 clients for whom a welfare chronology was requested. Table 3 presents the results of this effort showing clients' project closure status by their welfare status on the date of July 31, 1969. The latter date was arbitrarily chosen so as to standardize the results; since the data-gathering and interviewing processes were staggered (over a period of about four months) in the four states, some cut-off point had to be designated. Thus, Table 3 shows, for each category of clients, the number receiving assistance as of July 31, 1969; those definitely reported as not receiving assistance at that time; and those for whom no agency data on public assistance state were supplied.

Of the total number of clients on whom PA data were requested, information was provided on 81.7 percent. It can be noted from Table 3 that the category with the smallest proportion of no-information were the closed, not rehabilitated (14.7 percent). The other

TABLE 3

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS AS OF JULY 31, 1969, BY PROJECT CLOSURE STATUS FOR 1,411 CLIENTS ON WHOM PA DATA WERE REQUESTED

Public Assist. Status as of 7-31-69	Closed, Rehab.	Closed, Not Rehab.	Closed at referral, involuntarily	Closed at referral, voluntarily	Total
Receiving PA	134 (21.5)	109 (37.2)	75 (35.9)	81 (28.5)	399 (28.3)
Not receiving PA	368 (59.0)	141 (48.1)	97 (46.4)	147 (51.6)	753 (53.4)
No information	122 (19.5)	43 (14.7)	37 (17.7)	57 (20.0)	259 (18.4)
	624 (100.0)	293 (100.0)	209 (100.0)	285 (100.0)	1,411 (100.0)

three categories have similar proportions of clients with no agency data provided: 19.5, 17.7, and 20.0 percent for the closed rehabilitateds, CFI's and CFV's respectively.

Table 4 presents the same information in a somewhat different manner. Here, whether clients were interviewed (and if not, the reason for no-interview) is cross-classified by project closure status controlling for whether public assistance agency data were obtained. This allows us to determine the number of clients for whom neither interviews were completed nor agency data were obtained: 127 (or 9.0 percent) of 1,411 clients. Further, Table 4 shows that there were 132 persons interviewed for whom no welfare information (from the agency) was secured, and 423 clients on whom welfare agency data were gathered but who were not inter-

TABLE 4

INTERVIEW OUTCOME BY PROJECT CLOSURE STATUS CONTROLLING FOR WHETHER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DATA WERE OBTAINED

Whether Interviewed and if not, reason why not	Closed, Rehab.		Closed, Not Rehab.		Closed at referral involuntarily		Closed at referral voluntarily		Total	
	Welfare Status as of 7-31-69 Obtained									
	Yes	No Info.	Yes	No Info.	Yes	No Info.	Yes	No Info.	Yes	No Info.
Interviewed	317 (63.1)	63 (51.6)	152 (60.8)	26 (60.5)	103 (59.9)	13 (35.1)	157 (68.9)	30 (52.6)	729 (63.3)	132 (51.0)
Moved out of area	76 (15.1)	26 (21.3)	30 (12.0)	4 (9.3)	23 (13.4)	12 (32.4)	30 (13.2)	14 (24.6)	159 (13.8)	56 (21.6)
Could not locate	49 (9.8)	18 (14.8)	11 (4.4)	5 (11.6)	11 (6.4)	5 (13.5)	21 (9.2)	8 (14.0)	92 (8.0)	36 (13.9)
No Information	21 (4.2)	5 (4.1)	17 (6.8)	2 (4.6)	9 (5.2)	2 (5.4)	10 (4.4)	1 (1.8)	57 (4.9)	10 (3.9)
Unable	1 (0.2)	1 (0.8)	2 (0.8)	1 (2.3)	2 (1.2)	0 (---)	0 (---)	0 (---)	5 (0.4)	2 (0.8)
Institutionalized	0 (---)	1 (0.8)	2 (0.8)	0 (---)	0 (---)	0 (---)	0 (---)	0 (---)	2 (0.2)	1 (0.4)
Refused	6 (1.2)	3 (2.5)	4 (1.6)	0 (---)	3 (1.7)	1 (2.7)	2 (0.9)	0 (---)	15 (1.3)	4 (1.5)
Other	4 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.4)	1 (2.3)	0 (---)	0 (---)	0 (---)	1 (1.8)	5 (0.4)	3 (1.2)
Deceased	28 (5.6)	4 (3.3)	31 (12.4)	4 (9.3)	21 (12.2)	4 (10.8)	8 (3.5)	3 (5.3)	88 (7.6)	15 (5.8)
Total	502 (100.0)	122 (100.0)	250 (100.0)	43 (100.0)	172 (100.0)	37 (100.0)	228 (100.0)	57 (100.0)	1,152 (100.0)	259 (100.0)

viewed. Of the 1,411 clients in the target sample, complete interview and agency data were gathered on only 52 percent.

A Descriptive Overview of the Interviewed Clients: So that the reader will have a fairly clear picture of the sample of clients on whom interviews were completed, a brief description of this sample seems appropriate. Table 5 shows the percentage distributions of the total 861 interviewed clients on several variables. As Table 5 shows, nearly one-half (44 percent) of the interviewed clients had been closed as rehabilitated (CR) by the projects several years before the follow-up interview. An additional 21 percent were accepted for, and received, services but were closed as not rehabilitated (CNR). The remaining 35 percent did not receive services, with one-third (the CFIs) of them being denied services (due to unfeasible prognoses for rehabilitation during the referral stage), and two-thirds having voluntarily declined VR's offer of services (CFVs). In short, almost two-thirds of our interviewees (65 percent) received services during the joint projects one to seven years before our follow-up interview.

TABLE 5

A DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEWED SAMPLE
ON SEVERAL VARIABLES, IN PERCENTAGES (N=861)

Closure Status:	%
closed, rehabilitated (CR)	44.1
closed, not rehabilitated (CNR)	20.7
closed, involuntarily at referral (CFI)	13.5
closed, voluntarily at referral (CFV)	21.7
Received services (CR + CNR):	64.8
Did not receive services (CFI + CFV):	35.2

TABLE 5--Continued

State of Residence:	%
Arkansas	32.8
Florida	33.1
New Jersey	10.0
West Virginia	24.1

Sex of Respondents	%
Males	46.3
Females	53.7

Race of Respondents:	%
Whites	55.4
Blacks	44.6

Race and Sex:	%
White males	30.8
White females	24.6
Black males	15.6
Black females	29.0

Marital Status:	%
Married	48.4
Single	12.2
Widowed	10.8
Divorced	14.0
Separated	14.7

Severity of Disability as Reported by Client at Time of Interview:

Very severe	38.5
Fairly severe	30.1
Not severe	8.0
Have no disability	23.4

Whether Receiving Public Assistance at Time of Interview (based on agency reported data):

No	44.5
Yes, APTD	13.2
Yes, AFDC	24.8
Yes, OAA/MAA	5.1
Other	.7
No information from agency	11.7

Percentage of Each Closure Group Not Receiving Public Assistance At Time of Interview:

Closed, rehabilitated	53.0
Closed, not rehabilitated	36.5
Closed, at referral: involuntarily	31.9
Closed, at referral: voluntarily	42.2
Received services (CR + CNR):	47.8
Did not receive services (CFI + CFV):	38.3

Table 5 shows further that 66 percent of our subjects were Southerners (either from Arkansas or Florida). Ten percent were living in New Jersey and 24 percent in West Virginia.

Of the 861 interviewees, slightly over one-half were women (54 percent), and slightly over half were white (55 percent). White males and black females each comprise close to one-third of our sample (31 percent and 29 percent, respectively) with black males represented least with 16 percent.

Table 5 shows that 48.4 percent of our sample was married at the time of the interview, with approximately 12 percent single, and the remaining 30 percent either widowed, divorced or separated. It should be noted that marital status is highly associated with the sex of the respondent for the present sample. That is, among the 416 married interviewees, fully 72 percent are men while only 28 percent are women. Likewise, of the 340 whose marital status is dissolved--either widowed, divorced or separated--83 percent are women and only 17 percent are men. Stated another way, 75 percent of the total number of men in our sample (399) were married when we interviewed them, whereas only 26 percent of the (462) women were. This situation is also reflected in the total number of persons living in the home at the time of the interview (data not shown). On the average, the homes of the male project clients had five persons living there whereas the homes of the females, on the average, had slightly under four.

In the original study, we lamented the fact that we had no measure of the severity of the clients' disabilities. Thus, in our follow-up, we asked them how severe they felt their disabling condition was. Table 5 shows the distribution of clients on this question. Only 23 percent said they had no disability, while fully 38.5 percent said theirs was

"very severe." Another 30 percent assessed their disabling condition as "fairly severe" while only 8 percent said they had a disability but that it was not severe. With a total of 69 percent of our respondents saying that their disability was either "fairly severe" or "very severe," it is important to remember that our sample of respondents continues to have serious physical and/or emotional disabilities, one to seven years after their project closures.

It should, perhaps, be noted that reported severity of disability, like marital status, is highly associated with the sex of the respondents. That is, nearly one-half (47.5 percent) of our male interviewees perceived their disabilities as very severe, while less than one-third (30.8) of the women did. Our data analysis on the relationship of disabling conditions and dependency on public welfare (or social security) indicates that for the men, there is a very high association. Among the women, there is also an association, but it is not as strong as for the males. For the women in our sample, dependency appears to be due to a combination of (1) disabling condition, (2) large numbers of children, and (3) the absence of a spouse to help provide for family needs.

Two final factors may be noted from Table 5: First, according to public welfare agency data, 44.5 percent of our 861 interviewees were not receiving public assistance grants in July of 1969. Among those who were receiving PA, the largest percentage was receiving aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC; 56.5 percent of those on PA were receiving AFDC). The second largest percentage was receiving aid to the totally and Permanently Disabled (APTD; 30 percent of the 377 receiving), and a smaller percentage was on OAA or MAA (12.0 percent of those receiving). When we note the percentages

receiving no assistance from public welfare by closure status groups, we see that the rehabilitated (CR) clients have fared better than the other three groups (in terms of remaining independent of public assistance grants). Fifty-three percent of the CRs were independent of PA in July of 1969; this compares with 36.5 percent of the CNRs, 32 percent of the CFIs and 42 percent of the CFVs. Contrasting those who received project services (the CRs plus CNRs) with those who did not (the CFIs and CFVs), we see that approximately 10 percent more of the former were independent of public welfare.

In Table 6, we present the means and standard deviations on five variables by the closure status categories of received services (CR + CNR) versus did not receive services (CFI plus CFV). However, we also show a breakdown for the rehabilitated (CR) and not rehabilitated (CNR) groups. At the time of the follow-up interview, the group which received services during the projects perceived themselves as somewhat more severely disabled than the group which did not receive services, a mean score of 2.7 versus 2.5 (on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 indicating a very severe disability). Thus, that the former group, those who received services, but especially the CR clients, show up favorably on almost every criterion factor which we review indicates that the projects had a favorable impact on the lives of the clients who received services.

Noting the status score (in Table 6) of the occupations held by the clients, once again those clients who received services show up better. However, we should point out that these status scores, which are based on U.S. Census figures for the 1960 census, are very low. In 1960, only 20 percent of the U.S. labor force had status

TABLE 6

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON SEVERITY OF DISABILITY, OCCUPATIONAL STATUS (of Present or Last Job), AGE, EDUCATIONAL INDEX, AND TOTAL NUMBER IN THE HOME FOR EACH CLOSURE STATUS GROUP

Variables	Received Services			Did Not Receive Services	Total
	Total (N=558)	CR (N=380)	CNR (N=178)	(N=303)	(N=861)
Severity of disability[1]	2.7 (1.4)	2.5 (1.5)	3.3 (1.1)	2.5 (1.5)	2.6 (1.5)
Occupational status[2]	23.9 (20.8)	24.2 (21.1)	23.3 (20.0)	20.0 (18.8)	22.5 (20.2)
Age	45.9 (12.3)	45.0 (12.0)	48.0 (13.1)	43.6 (13.0)	46.9 (12.9)
Education[3]	2.3 (1.4)	2.4 (1.4)	2.0 (1.3)	2.2 (1.2)	2.2 (1.4)
Total number in home	4.4 (2.5)	4.5 (2.5)	4.1 (2.4)	4.2 (2.6)	4.3 (2.6)

[1]Measured on a scale from 1 through 4; one indicates no reported disability and four, a very severe one.

[2]This score is for the client's present occupation or, if presently unemployed but has worked any since closure, it is the status score of the last occupation held. It is based on U.S. Census status scores, used in 1960 and 1970 censuses

[3]The education scale utilized was as follows:

0=No response
1=No formal education or some grade school
2=Completed grade school (sixth grade)
3=Some high school (7-11)
4=Some technical school or training after dropping grade or high school
5=Completed high school
6=Business or technical training after high school completing
7=Some college
8=Completed college
9=Graduate work

scores below 30 (on a range of from 01 to 99--with 99 indicating the highest status jobs). Once again, we are reminded that the present sample is a severely disadvantaged one, not only in terms of the low-status jobs which they are able to gain and hold, but also educationally and health-wise.

The average age of our sample is 47 years, with approximately 66 percent of the respondents falling between thirty-four and sixty years of age. Thus, these persons are not young people, recently embarked on work and family careers, but adult Americans whose lives have been marked by ill-health and lack of skills in the labor market; the data in Table 6 illustrate this point. The average educational level of these 861 adults is slightly higher than seventh grade. Among those who received services, the average is eight years as opposed to seven for those who did not; further, among the rehabilitated, the average is closer to nine years. Fully two-thirds of our respondents have educational attainment levels ranging between some grade school and some high school. Only 12 percent actually completed the twelfth grade or better.

The last item in Table 6, total number in the home, indicates that, on the average, the clients in our sample who received services have slightly larger families than those who did not receive services. In particular, the CRs had the largest number of people in the home. It should be kept in mind, here, that these summary figures, say, of 4.5 persons in the home, are averages and as such obscure, to some extent, the true situation in which many of these clients live. These closure status categories lump together the single and older clients (who have no children at home) with those clients in their mid-thirties

and forties who have large numbers of children in the home. The modal number of children for the families in the present sample is four, with 38 percent (of those who have ever had any children) having five or more. Eighty-eight percent of the sample had had at least one child, and of these 759 clients, only 26 percent had stopped with one or two children.

In closing this general description of the interviewed sample of clients, three points should be emphasized: (1) The clients in the closed at referral, involuntarily (C'I) category constitute a 10 percent sample of all clients who were denied project services due to unfeasible prognosis. In contrast, the clients in the other three closure statuses are populations; that is, everyone closed as rehabilitated, not rehabilitated, or as voluntarily declined in all four states, was included in our target population. (2) Some caution should be used in comparing the following two groups when assessing the effects of the project efforts: received services versus did not receive services. The reasons for this are two-fold: (a) the group which received service is 64 percent white while the other group is only 40 percent white; and (b) the former group is 51 percent male, while the latter group is 37 percent male. These aspects of the two groups are important because the data on the present sample show considerable evidence of differential employment by sex and race. For example, whites of both sexes have higher status jobs than both sexes of the black clients. However, pay or wage discrimination seems to be more detrimental to the females than males of both races; that is, despite the higher educational levels of the women (than the men)in the present

sample, the women received a much lower weekly wage on their job at the time of the interview. Among only those clients who were employed full-time when interviewed, the white males were receiving an average of $16.31 per week more than the black males, but $33.88 per week more than the white females and $39.12 per week more than the black females. More will be said of this in the Chapter on "Income at the Time of the Interview."

CHAPTER III

SERVICES PROVIDED, SERVICES PERCEIVED

The analysis in this Chapter will draw on the information collected on the interview schedule along with information collected by the agency on the Data II sheet of the original study. The number of clients used for this analysis will be 861 reflecting the completion rate of our interview survey.

The main thrust of this Chapter will be to relate patterns of service provision to two groups: closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated. However, the point has been made that the counselors and caseworkers of the two participating agencies were involved with the clients at the initial referral stage. This pattern of interaction will be reviewed particularly in light of those clients who were eligible but voluntarily refused to participate in the program.

Involvement of Counselors and Caseworkers at the Referral Stage: In the previous Chapter a description of the screening process was reviewed indicating why applicants for public assistance did not participate in the program at the referral stage. Counselors and caseworkers interviewed these applicants to determine eligibility and encourage them to participate by explaining the potential benefits to be derived from such a program.

Table 7 presents the amount of personal involvement with these

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWS WITH VR COUNSELORS DURING REFERRAL PROCESS BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME

Number of Interviews	Received Service			Did Not Receive Services	Total
	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed Not Rehabilitated		
None	5.2	2.9	10.1	16.8	9.3
1	25.4	22.9	30.9	29.0	26.7
2	20.4	21.1	19.1	19.1	20.0
3	15.4	17.9	10.1	10.6	13.7
4	11.1	10.8	11.8	11.9	11.4
5	5.0	5.5	3.9	2.6	4.2
6	3.0	2.6	3.9	3.3	3.1
7	3.2	3.9	1.7	2.6	3.0
8	1.1	.8	1.7	.7	.9
9 or more	10.0	11.6	6.7	3.3	7.7
Mean	3.3	3.6	2.8	2.4	3.0

applicants at the initial stage of the project. We combined the closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated into one category of those who received service. We combined the closed from referral, voluntarily and the closed from referral, involuntarily into the second category of those not receiving services. In this light those who received services had, on the average, 3.3 interviews while those who were eligible but did not receive services had, on the average, 2.8 interviews. It is true that, when this project started, emphasis on out reach programs and techniques to encourage people to participate were just beginning. The probability is high that this group of voluntary refusals would be much lower today. The amount of personal involvement between counselors and case workers

and those who were declared ineligible was the least of all with only an average of 1.6 visits. It is clear that this group did not fit the guidelines for participation and generally it took only on interview to establish this. At the referral stage, the more personal involvement that the professionals had with the potential client, the greater the chances were that he or she would be accepted for participation in the program.

Agency Provided Service for Those Participating in the Joint Program:

Just as personal involvement by the professional staff was an important factor in who participated in the program, it was an equally important factor in determining successful rehabilitation.

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF CR AND CNR CLIENTS RECEIVING INTERVIEWS WITH VR COUNSELORS DURING PROJECT

Number of Interviews	CR No.	CR %	CNR No.	CNR %
None	20	5.3	21	11.8
One	26	6.8	11	6.2
Two	44	11.6	24	13.5
Three - Four	87	22.9	50	28.1
Five - Six	68	17.9	30	16.8
Seven - Eight	36	9.5	10	5.6
Nine - Ten	34	9.0	9	5.1
Eleven - Twelve	19	5.0	11	6.2
Thirteen - Nineteen	38	10.0	12	6.7
Total	380	100.0	178	100.0
Mean:	8.4		4.9	

Table 8 shows the number of interviews received by the CR and CNR clients during the course of the projects. As the data show, the CR

clients received more VR counselor attention during the projects than the CNR clients. While 5.3 percent of the CR's received no interviews during the project, 11.8 percent of the CNR's had none. Also, the average number of interviews received was 8.4 for the CR clients as compared with 4.9 for the CNR's. The greater the personal involvement of the professional staff as indicated by number of interviews made to client during the project, the greater the probability for successful rehabilitation.

Table 9 shows the rehabilitated (CR) and not rehabilitated (CNR) clients who received each type of service provided by VR during the projects. These data show that a larger percentage of the CR clients received each type of service listed, with the exception of maintenance

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGES OF CLIENTS RECEIVING VR SERVICES DURING THE PROJECTS--
AT COST OR AT NO COST BY CLOSURE STATUS

Services	CR (N=380)		CNR (N=178)		Total (N=558)		
	At Cost	At No Cost	At Cost	At No Cost	At Cost	At No Cost	All
Rehabilitation Centers	5.8%	2.4%	3.9%	2.2%	5.2%	2.3%	7.5%
Workshops	2.4	1.6	2.2	1.7	2.3	1.6	3.9
Diagnostic	84.2	9.5	76.4	12.9	81.7	10.6	92.3
Surgery and Treatment	41.0	7.9	20.8	9.0	34.6	8.2	42.8
Prosthetic Appliances	22.6	1.0	11.2	2.8	20.8	1.6	20.6
Hospitalization and Convalescence	21.8	7.9	8.4	5.6	17.6	7.2	24.7
Job training/ Training Mats.	18.4	2.4	9.0	3.4	15.4	2.7	18.1
Maintenance and Transportation	33.4	8.2	36.5	7.3	34.4	7.9	42.3
Tools, equipment and Licenses	4.7	1.8	1.1	1.7	3.6	1.8	5.4
Other	10.3	1.0	9.0	2.2	9.9	1.4	11.3

and transportation. Slightly more of the CNR clients (44 percent) than the CR clients (42 percent) received the latter service. The single type of service which was received by most of the clients was interviews with VR personnel, including direct interviews with the client as well as with client family members, employers and/or other placement sources. The second most-generally provided services were those involving health or physical restoration activities; of the 558 CR and CNR clients, only 35 (or 6.3 percent) failed to receive at least one health service. The third most-generally provided services were those of a maintenance nature; 47 percent of the CR and CNR clients received at least one service of this type. And, finally, the category of services provided fewest of the accepted clients were those of a job-training/re-training nature; only 123, or 22 percent, of the clients received services of this type. The data in Table 10 suggest that the more services a client receives from VR, the greater his chances for a successful rehabilitation. In particular, this generalization appears to hold only for services which involve health or physical restoration and/or job-training or related services. That is, the receipt of maintenance/transportation services apparently had little direct influence on rehabilitation outcome. Specifically, services provided during project by VR, which were health and/or job-training related, increased the chances of a successful rehabilitation.

Moving on to review the data on services provided by the Public Assistance agencies during the projects, Table 10 shows that very similar percentages of the clients in each closure status, CR and CNR, received each type of PA service. The greatest differences appear to involve educational or vocational training and health services,

in that more of the CNR than CR clients received services of these types (the differences favoring the CNR clients are 6.1 and 7.8 percent, respectively). When the percentage differences favor the

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF CR AND CNR CLIENTS WHO RECEIVED PUBLIC WELFARE SERVICES DURING PROJECT

Services by PW	CR (N=380)		CNR (N=178)	
	#	%	#	%
Education or Vocational Training	197	51.8	103	57.9
Health	224	59.0	119	66.8
Improving Family	126	33.2	65	36.5
Maintaining Family	135	35.5	61	34.3
Protection of Children	78	20.5	30	16.8
Protection of Adults	26	6.8	19	10.7
Return Adults Home	10	2.6	4	2.2
Self-Care	49	12.9	16	9.0
Main or Improve Social Relation Participation in Community Life	47	12.4	17	9.6
Self-Support	164	43.2	76	42.7

CR clients, in no instance is this difference greater than 4 percent (3.9 percent more of the CR than CNR clients received self care services). The services provided by PA had no observable effect on the clients' chances of successful rehabilitation.

Delivery of Agency Services as Perceived by the Client:

In this section, the question is posed as to how the clients, some two to four years after project closure, perceive the delivery of services by the project agencies. Included in the interview were questions regarding ten specific services offered by either or both of the two agencies and the clients were asked to indicate which agencies furnished the services, or if neither or both did. Table 11 furnishes a summary

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY AGENCY AND CLOSURE STATUS OF CLIENTS PERCEPTION OF SERVICES RECEIVED

Type of Service	Agency: Voc. Rehab.		Public Welfare		Both		Neither	
	CR	CNR	CR	CNR	CR	CNR	CR	CNR
1. Money to support yourself and family	4	5	61	66	6	5	29	24
2. Medical Services, dental care or drugs	44	26	27	50	14	11	15	13
3. Rehabilitative devices such as eye glasses, hearing aid, artificial limb, wheel chair, etc.	25	17	16	29	1	0	58	54
4. Help for emotional problems	13	10	7	14	2	3	78	73
5. Help with family problems	7	4	17	21	4	6	72	69
6. Vocational or trade school training	26	15	2	4	2	2	70	79
7. On the job training	14	12	1	2	0	0	85	86
8. College education, tuition fees	4	2	0	1	1	0	95	97
9. Job Counseling and guidance	38	40	6	5	4	4	52	51
10. Help respondent find a job	16	10	2	3	2	2	80	85

of the results of the clients' responses to these questions.

There are several broad generalizations which can be made concerning the delivery of services by the two agencies as perceived by the clients in this study. First, with the exception of financial support which was provided largely by Public Assistance, the remaining services were

perceived by the clients as given by one or the other of the two agencies. Second, the two services perceived as being received most frequently by the clients were financial support for the client and his family, and medical, dental, and drug services. Third, there is a consistent variation in which clients received service by closure status. This variation can be seen in the pattern of services rendered in the case of medical services and of providing rehabilitative devices. In the former case, that of medical services, 44 percent of the CR clients indicated that this service was provided by vocational rehabilitation, and 27 percent perceived it as provided by public welfare. In the case of the CNR clients, however, 26 percent perceived this service as provided by vocational rehabilitation and 50 percent perceived it as provided by public welfare. A similar pattern prevails in the provision of rehabilitative devices. In the case of the closed rehabilitated, 25 percent identified vocational rehabilitation as the agency providing this service, with 16 percent indicating public welfare; in the case of the CNR clients, however, a reverse pattern is found with 17 percent identifying VR as the provider of this service and 29 percent, PW.

Evaluation of Services Offered: In addition to identifying the services which the client recalled as offered to him, some questions were asked in a more general framework than just regarding specific services. One question was phrased as follows: "During the project, what did your vocational rehabilitation counselor do that you felt was helpful? I'll read you some things he or she might have done and you can tell me if your counselor did it for you." The five broad areas which were

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY AGENCY AND CLOSURE STATUS OF RATING OF HELPFUL OF SERVICES RECEIVED

	VR Percent Feel Helpful		PW Percent Feel Helpful	
	CR	CNR	CR	CNR
Arranging Medical Services	66.3	47.0	38.4	46.1
Arranging Job Training	30.8	20.2		
Talking With Respondent	76.8	64.6	55.3	56.2
Giving Job Information	30.3	27.5		
Was Not Helpful	4.7	11.8	5.3	7.9
Did Not See Respondent	3.9	9.6	18.2	10.7
Help Financial Problems			61.8	64.6
Help Childrens' Problems			25.0	25.3

thought typical of the services provided by vocational rehabilitation counselors were: (1) helped you get a job, (2) arranged for medical services, (3) arranged for job training, (4) talked with you, and (5) gave you job information; also, there was a space for Other. The rank order of frequency with which these services were mentioned can be seen in Table 12. The most frequently checked service was talking with the respondent, followed by arranging for medical services. There was a drop off from these two to another group of two services: arranging job training and giving job information. The differential between

reception of services by the CR and CNR clients is evident here as well as in our previous discussion. In all types of services a smaller proportion of the CNR than CR clients viewed services as helpful. Also in a negative way, a question was placed as to whether the counselor was helpful and here, again, the not rehabilitated clients indicated less perception of services in that 12 percent said that the counselor was not helpful and 10 percent said that they did not see the counselor at all. When we combine the information from the last two tables, the clients' perceptions of the quantity and quality of services rendered by VR counselors emerge quite clearly. The services VR provides most effectively and most frequently are arranging for medical services and general counseling of the client.

In the case of public welfare caseworkers, the clients were asked to indicate whether the counselor was helpful in our four broad areas: helped with financial problems, helped with childrens' problems, talked with respondent, and arranged for medical and dental services. As might have been expected, both the CR and CNR clients ranked trying to help with financial problems as the service most helpful to them, followed by the caseworker talked with the respondent; third was arranged for medical services; and fourth, helped with childrens' problems. In the cases of arranging for medical services and talking with the respondent, the highest proportion of clients tended to identify this service with vocational rehabilitation. In the case of the services identified broadly as relating to vocational rehabilitation, a higher proportion of the CR clients indicated these services were helpful than did the CNR clients. In the case of those services identified with public welfare, there seems to be about equal distribution of the CR and CNR clients; and in these two cases, the higher proportion

declaring the services helpful was in the CNR category rather than in the CR one. In other words, the evaluation of what the caseworker did seemed to be more evenly divided between the two closure groups whereas in the case of the vocational rehabilitation counselor, the CR clients seemed to perceive VR counselor services as more helpful. The services Public Assistance provided most effectively and most frequently were providing help for financial problems and general counseling of the client.

Evaluation of Most Helpful Service Rendered by the Two Agencies: The clients were then asked to indicate the most helpful service rendered by vocational rehabilitation counselors and/or public welfare caseworkers. The results of this evaluation are summarized in Table 13 and Table 14. In the clients' perceptions, arranging for medical services was the most helpful service rendered by VR counselors, and this service was thought of as one rendered primarily by the vocational rehabilitation counselor. This is evidenced by the fact that 50 percent of those clients closed as rehabilitated indicated that the most helpful service from the vocational rehabilitation counselor was arranging for medical services as compared with 11.6 percent of those clients who thought that this was the most helpful service provided by public welfare caseworkers. The clients perceived that the most helpful service rendered by public welfare caseworkers was the one of furnishing financial aid and assistance. A second observation which appears to be consistent throughout the clients' evaluations is the differential proportion in closed rehabilitated and closed not rehabilitated who define what is the most helpful service rendered by vocational rehabilitation. By this, we mean that 50 percent of the CR clients identified arranging medical

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF VR SERVICES WHICH WERE THOUGHT MOST HELPFUL BY CLIENT BY CLOSURE STATUS

Services	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed, Not Rehabilitated
	Percent	Percent
Arranging Medical Services	50.3	36.5
Arranging for Job Interview	13.2	8.4
Talking with Respondent	12.1	20.8
Helping get a Job	6.8	2.2
Giving Job Information	1.6	2.8
Other	3.4	1.7
Unable to Say	12.6	27.5

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC WELFARE SERVICES WHICH WERE THOUGHT MOST HELPFUL BY CLIENT BY CLOSURE STATUS

Services	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed, Not Rehabilitated
	Percent	Percent
Financial Problems	47.6	54.5
Arranging Medical and Dental Services	11.6	12.9
Talking with Respondent	5.8	2.2
Childrens Problems	3.9	1.7
Other	3.2	2.2
Unable to Say	27.9	26.4

services as the most important as compared to only 36 percent of the CNR's. This differential is present in all but two instances in the evaluation of the services.

Summary

This Chapter has briefly examined five major areas which relate directly to either the provision of services to the client by the agency, or to the receipt of such services as perceived by the client. In the first major area, that of the extent of involvement of counselors and caseworkers with the client at the time of referral, it was found that the more personally involved the agency staff becomes during the referral period with the potential client, the greater the likelihood of the client being accepted for services.

The second major area deals with services provided for the participants in the joint program. Again it was concluded that the greater the involvement of the staff the greater the client's chances for successful rehabilitation.

Not only is there a direct relationship between the number of counselor interviews and the chances of successful rehabilitation, but also, there exists a direct relationship between the number of different services provided and the chances for successful rehabilitation. This finding is especially true for services which involve health or physical restoration and/or job training or related services.

With regard to the services provided by the PA agencies, it was found that similar percentages of clients in either closure status, CR or CNR, received each type of PA service. In other words, the closure status of the client does not discriminate among the various types of services provided by PA. It is concluded that the service

provided the client by PA had no observable effect on the clients' chances for successful rehabilitation.

The third major area previously discussed deals with the delivery of services as perceived by the client. Exclusive of financial support, which nearly 2/3 of either the CR or CNR groups felt came entirely from PW, the remaining services were largely perceived by the clients as originating from either one agency or the other. In addition, the two services perceived by the client as being most frequently received are financial support for the client and medical, dental, and drug services. Finally it was found that the closure status discriminated among the types of services received as perceived by the client.

The fourth major area examined the clients' evaluation of services offered by the agencies. It was found that the client, regardless of closure status, viewed the VR counselor as being most helpful when the counselor was talking with the respondent, or when the counselor arranged for medical services. Then, too, regardless of type of service being discussed, the CRs were more likely to rate the service as being helpful than were the CNRs. It is concluded that based upon the clients' evaluations, the services which are most frequently and most effectively provided by VR are arranging for medical services and general counseling.

With regard to the PW caseworkers, both CR and CNR rated help with financial problems as being the most beneficial service provided by PA. This was followed by general counseling; next was provision of medical services; and last was help with childrens' problems.

It is interesting to notice that in the case of services usually

associated with VR, a greater proportion of CR than CNR indicated these services were helpful. On the other hand, those services usually identified with PW, a greater proportion of CNR than CR viewed these services as helpful. In any event, it is concluded that based upon the clients' evaluations, the services which were most frequently and effectively provided by PW were financial and counseling assistance.

The last major area discussed previously in this Chapter deals with the clients' evaluations of most helpful service rendered by the two agencies. The clients felt that the most helpful service offered by VR counselors was arranging for medical services, and further, this particular service was felt to be offered primarily by the VR counselor. On the other hand, the clients felt that the most helpful service offered by PW was furnishing financial aid. Finally, it was found that the closure status of the client discriminated among the most helpful services rendered by VR. Fully one-half of the CR group felt that the provision of medical services was the most important service provided by VR, as opposed to slightly over 1/3 of the CNR group. On the other hand, 21 percent of the CNR, and only 12 percent of the CR group felt talking with respondent was the most important service rendered.

CHAPTER IV

THE CLIENTS' WELFARE CHRONOLOGY: ASSESSMENT OF JOINT PROGRAM THROUGH AGENCY OBTAINED DATA ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Introduction

One phase of the data collection in the follow-up study included a request to the public assistance agencies in the four projects for a welfare history on each applicant for public assistance who was referred to the program, between the dates of January, 1963, and July 31, 1969.

The records on which the analysis in this Chapter is based is limited to 1,064 of the target population of 1,411. Data on PA status were supplied for only 1,152 for whom data were secured, 88 (or 7.6 percent) were deceased. Since there was no way for us to determine the date on which expiration of these clients occurred, it seemed advisable to exclude them from the sample. Included in the 1,064 case records analyzed are many of the interviewed clients (729) as well as many of the not located clients (335).

Before proceeding to the results of the data analysis, one additional point should be noted. According to the figures to be presented, only 36.5 percent of the 1,064 clients in the sample were receiving public assistance payments as of July 31, 1969. There is considerable evidence that this figure may be too low; that is, it no doubt is fairly accurate for the clients who were living in one of the six counties on that date. However, there is really no way to determine the welfare status of the clients who had moved out of one of these counties. It

was reported by the project interviewers that 251 of the 1,064 sample clients (or 23.0 percent) had at the time of the interview either moved from the county or were unable to be located. It is possible that some of these clients reported by the PW agencies as inactive may well have been receiving welfare in some other county or state.[2]

A Review of the Agency Reported Data:

In Chapter I, mention was made of at least six points which would be covered in the analysis of the PA agency data. These six points included average number of weeks per year since closure that clients received PA grants; the average number of applications and approvals per year; changes in category by type of PA received during this time-period; type of PA received as of July 31, 1969; and the monetary size of the PA grants for those receiving assistance as of July 31, 1969.

The average length of time covered by these records was 44 months. During this period they had been on public assistance an average of nineteen weeks per year. Only one out of every seven made an application per year with only one out of every ten being approved.

The average number of applications per year as well as average number of approvals per year seem rather low. In reviewing the records, it was found that 424 clients had never received public assistance since closure. During the period from closure to collection of data, 410 applied for public assistance and only 312 received approval. Some 230 clients were on public assistance after their records were closed were

---

[2]The evidence which leads to the foregoing conclusion centers on the located (and/or interviewed) clients. Of the 729 clients in the present sub-sample who were interviewed on whom agency data were obtained (and who therefore are known to have been residing in the same county as where the project occurred) the agencies reported that 45.8 percent were receiving public assistance as of July 31, 1969. This percentage is considerably higher than the 36.5 percent for the total sample of 1,064.

receiving benefits from public assistance agencies on the average of 32 weeks per year.

Effectiveness of Joint Program as Revealed by Public Assistance Records:

One of the goals of this joint program was to provide rehabilitation services in an effort to remove clients from dependency on public assistance. In reviewing the public assistance records, we were covering anywhere from three to five years after the client had left the program either closed rehabilitated or closed not rehabilitated. In either case they had received some service from the joint program.

In looking at Table 15, it should be noted that, for the group receiving service, the time lapsed is shorter by one year than for the group who did not receive service.

TABLE 15

Average Number of Years, Average Number of Weeks Per Year on Public Assistance, and Average Number of Applications and Approvals Per Year Since Project Closure for Those Receiving Service by Closure Status and for Those Not Receiving Services

	Average Number Years Since Project Closure	Average Number Weeks/year On PA Since Closure	Average Number of Applications for PA/year Since Closure	Average Number of Approvals for PA/year Since Closure
Received Service	3.45	19.90	.12	.08
Closed, Rehabilitated	3.46	15.29	.11	.07
Closed, Not Rehabilitated	3.53	24.26	.15	.10
Not Receiving Services	4.52	21.81	.16	.10
Total	3.84	19.30	.15	.10

There is little information relating to other group experiences in the use of public assistance over a period of time. But in this study the applicants for public assistance had been on public assistance on the average of 19 weeks out of each year for the past three years. Those public assistance applicants who had been accepted for service had a welfare history of a little over 20 weeks per year as compared to 22 weeks per year for those applicants for assistance not accepted in the program. Within the category accepted for service, the closed rehabilitated had an average number of weeks on public assistance of 15 weeks service where there is a difference of 9 weeks between those rehabilitated and those not. Length of time spent on public assistance was less for those receiving service and the shortest period of all was for those receiving service and closed rehabilitated. Although the time spent on public assistance favored those who have received services, the differences assume greater qualitative importance when it is realized that the group who received services had 60 percent with a secondary disability as compared with 36 percent of those who did not receive services. The presence of a secondary disability was considered a measure of the severity of the disabling condition. For those who were successfully rehabilitated, the average number of weeks on public assistance of this three year period showed an average difference of ten weeks for those not rehabilitated and a difference of six weeks less than those who did not receive services. This was accomplished in the face of the fact that 60 percent of the group rehabilitated had a secondary disability as contrasted to 36 percent of the group who did not receive services.

The less time spent on public assistance represents more time employed in the labor market. Yet the group receiving services had a

more unfavorable employment record prior to entering the program. Approximately 24 percent had not worked full-time in the five years prior to referral as contrasted to only 15 percent of those not receiving services. Within the group receiving services, those closed not rehabilitated had the most unfavorable work history of all the groups with 32 percent having no full-time employment in the five years prior to referral. Thus, if the proportion with a high severity of disability and an unfavorable work history prior to referral is taken into account, the lower average time on public assistance in the last three years for those receiving services was more impressive in that a higher proportion had secondary disabilities and unfavorable employment history prior to entering the program.

Although there was no way we could compare the average number of weeks per year on public assistance with some previous period, it is clear that dependency on public assistance is much less (15.3 weeks) for those who were successfully rehabilitated than for any other group. The most dependent group of public assistance was the closed not rehabilitated.

Change in type of Public Assistance: The five year history of the clients' public welfare records allowed us to analyze the changes in types of assistance received between closure date and July, 1969. The majority of clients received primarily the same type of PA year after year; at least, over a period of time as brief as the one covered here, one to seven years, the data suggest that this is the case. Changes in types of PA over this time were reported for only 75 clients. Two types of changes were most frequent: first, from AFDC only to AFDC plus APTD (17 clients, or 22.7 percent

TABLE 16

(Percent Distribution) Whether Applicants had a Secondary Disability at Referral by Rehabilitation Outcome

Whether had Secondary Disability	Received Service			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed, Rehabilitated	Closed, Not Rehabilitated		
Yes	61.3	59.7	65.3	36.9	52.8
No	39.9	40.3	34.7	63.1	47.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	(693)	(474)	(219)	(371)	(1,064)

TABLE 17

Percent Distribution of Number of Years Since Client Worked Full-Time (At Referral) by Rehabilitation Outcome

Number of Years Since Worked Full-Time	Received Services			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed, Rehabilitated	Closed, Not Rehabilitated		
Less than one year	28.6	32.5	20.1	38.0	31.8
More than one, less than 3	18.2	16.7	21.5	21.8	19.5
More than 3, less than 5	11.5	11.0	12.8	6.5	9.8
5 years or more	24.2	20.7	32.0	14.8	21.0
Never	17.0	18.6	13.7	18.6	17.6
Unknown	.5	.6	.0	.3	.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	693	(474)	(219)	371	(1,064)

of the 75); and second, from APTD to Old Age Assistance (16, or 21.3 percent). The third most frequent changes was from AFDC to APTD (12, or 16.0 percent); fourth, from AFDC plus APTD to AFDC only (or 9.3 percent); and fifth, from AFDC plus OAA to DAA only. All remaining types of changes--of which there were fifteen-involved only one or two clients. It should be noted that many more of the clients--than only 75--changed PA status during the years after closure; however, their pattern was one of moving from the status of recipient to non-recipient or vice versa. In the event that they did reapply, they tended to be approved for the same type of assistance they had received previously.

Public Assistance Status As of July 1, 1969

In the previous section we have viewed the program in light of the applicants five year public assistance record. Here the analysis focuses on their status at the time the records were compiled. At that

TABLE 18

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS AS OF JULY 1, 1969
BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME AND CLOSURE STATUS

Public Assistance Status	Received Service			Not Received Service	Total
	Total	Closed, Rehabilitated	Closed, Not Rehabilitated		
Inactive	65.8	72.2	51.4	59.3	63.5
APTD	8.2	4.6	16.4	12.9	9.9
APTD and AFDC	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.3	1.8
AFDC	20.5	18.4	25.2	19.4	20.1
plus other but not APTD	.2	.4	.0	.3	.3
OAA	1.9	1.5	2.8	6.2	3.4
AB	.2	.2	.5	.0	.2
Misc.	1.2	.6	1.9	.6	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	693	470	214	371	1064

Note: Recall the caution discussed in the Introduction to this Chapter relating to the reported percentages of inactives.

time 65.8 percent of those who had received services were inactive as far as the public assistance records were concerned as compared with 59.3 percent of those who had not received service. This leaves 237 of those who were receiving service on some type of public assistance at that time. Of this number, 144, or 60.8 percent, were receiving AFDC benefits. This would indicate that of those who had received service and were on public assistance at the time the records were tabulated, six out of ten were receiving AFDC benefits, who in most cases were women with children. For those who had not received service, 151 were receiving some form of public assistance and of this number 73 or five out of every ten were receiving AFDC benefits.

Among those who had received services and were on some type of public assistance, 24 percent were receiving APTD benefits which in most cases would prevent them from seeking employment. For those who had not received services 31 percent receiving some form of public assistance were recieving APTD; this suggests that approximately one out of five clients on public assistance in 1969 were chronic disability cases who would not be eligible for employment.

Public Assistance Status At Time of Interview: An additional check on the number of persons in this study receiving public assistance is the question asked at the time of interview. There is a difference between the information received from the client at this time, some three to six months after the period included in the welfare records. The difference could be in the perception of the client or represent a change in status during this six month period.

TABLE 19

Percent Distribution of Type of Public Assistance Received At Time of Interview by Rehabilitation Outcome

Type of Public Assistance	Received Service			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed, Not Rehabilitated		
Inactive	47.8	53.2	36.5	38.3	44.5
AFDC	22.2	20.0	27.0	21.5	22.0
APTD	11.0	6.8	19.7	17.5	13.2
OAA	3.6	2.6	5.6	7.9	5.1
Other	3.9	3.7	4.5	2.6	3.5
No information	11.5	13.7	6.7	12.2	11.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	(558)	(380)	(178)	(303)	(861)

According to the self report of the total interviewed 55.5 percent were receiving some type of public assistance as contrasted to 36.5 percent as reported six months earlier from the welfare records. (Table 19). This is quite a difference and if some of the ones where no information could be collected, 11.7 percent, were on public assistance, it would increase the difference even more.

When public assistance status is viewed by rehabilitation outcome, the number who were inactive, not receiving public assistance, decreases from 65.8 percent, welfare records data, to 47.8 percent, self report at time of interview, a decrease of 18 percent. The difference for those not receiving service is 21 percent, from 59.3 percent to 38.3 percent. The difference between these two sources of information is 19 percent. The self-reporting of the clients at time of interview places approximately 19 percent more of them on public assistance than did the welfare records. The proportion receiving each type of public assistance did not vary to much between the two reports, although there was an increase

in proportion receiving APTD in the self-reported data.

Public Assistance Payments as of July 31:

According to the records, the average amount of payments received by these clients from Public Assistance as of July 31, 1969 was $36.44. As indicated in Table 20 the average payments were greater for those who had received service, $39.32, than for those who had not received services ($31.06).

TABLE 20

Average Amount of Public Assistance Payments as of July 31, 1969 by Rehabilitation Outcome

Public Assistance Payment	Received Service			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed, Not Rehabilitated		
Mean Payments All in Category	$39.32	$31.82	$56.12	$31.06	$36.44
Mean for Only Those Receiving P.A.[a]	$118.40	$120.02	$116.60	$79.47	$103.40
Percentage in Category Receiving P.A. On 7/31/69	33.2%	27.6%	48.6%	39.1%	36.5%

[a]For thirteen cases who were reported as active on P.A., no information regarding the size of their monthly grants was given. Thus, they are excluded from this column but not included in the percentage one.

When the closure status of those receiving service was examined, the closed rehabilitated had a higher mean average payment. However, this is explained by looking at the last row in the Table which gives the percentage of the category receiving public assistance. As has been discussed earlier, a smaller proportion of those receiving ser-

vices were receiving public assistance payments and a smaller proportion of those closed rehabilitated were on public assistance. When payments are related to those receiving public assistance, the average amount of payments received goes up in every category. In fact, the average amounts by categories is reversed with those not recieving services receiving, on the average, $40.00 a month less. Although those who were closed rehabilitated had only about three out of ten receiving public assistance payments, they were, on the average, the highest payments in any category.

One explanation for these differences in payments by rehabilitation outcome could be that the four states had different levels of public assistance funding. For the period under consideration in this study, New Jersey had the highest average payment with $162.77 per month; West Virginia was second highest with $128.66; and Florida and Arkansas were very low with $75.33 and $70.00, respectively. From this it is clear that the state of residence is more important than rehabilitation outcome as far as the amount of average public assistance payments. The greater part of the difference in average monthly payment between those receiving services and those not receiving services can be accounted for by the fact that only nine percent of those not receiving service are from New Jersey or West Virginia, the states with the highest average payments, as compared to 46.9 percent of those receiving services.

Summary

We can briefly summarize this Chapter by saying that the group accepted for service averaged 19.9 weeks on public assistance per year, while the group not accepted for service averaged 21.8 weeks per year

on welfare. Yet, when we take into account the previous work history and the degree of severity of disability, we find that the group accepted for services was more severely disabled and least prepared to assume the status of rehabilitated.

For the most part, most PA recipients continued to receive the same type of PA year after year; there is very little evidence to suggest a change in PA type, other than the change from recipient to non-recipient, and vice versa. According to the public assistance record, the PA status at the time of the interview, two-thirds of the group accepted for services were not on the PA rolls as compared to 60 percent of the unaccepted group. Among those receiving welfare, 60 percent of the group accepted for services were on AFDC, and 24 percent on APTD. The comparable figures for the group not accepted for services are 98 percent and 31 percent.

Finally, we observed that the group accepted for services received a larger average amount of public assistance than did the group not accepted for service. At the same time, it should be pointed out that there were proportionally fewer recipients from the accepted group than from the group not accepted for service. Also, the amount of public assistance funding was mainly due to the level of funding of the state of residence. In the absence of a uniform basis for funding for recipients of public assistance, the differential can be as much as twice the payment from one state to another.

CHAPTER V

MAJOR SOURCES OF INCOME

One indication of accomplishing the long term goals of decreasing the dependency on public assistance is the amount of income derived from other than public assistance. In this Chapter we will present information on sources of income including that derived from public assistance. The less these clients depend on public assistance as their total source of income and the more they are able to find employment, the greater are the accomplishments of this program.

At the time of interview, the clients were asked what were their major sources of income. Twenty-nine percent of the entire 861 indicated that their major source of income was from their own earnings. Another 11 percent indicated the major source of their income was contributed by other members of the family including spouse, children or parents. As indicated by the Table, there are observable differences in the portion of clients receiving their major source of income from their own earnings or from members of the family by rehabilitation outcome. For those receiving no services, 38 percent gave, as major source of income, family or their own earnings as compared to 41 percent of those receiving services. The greatest differential is among those who received service, where the successfully rehabilitated reported over 50 percent listing their major source of income as family or their own earnings; this is in contrast to those who received service but were not successfully rehabilitated, where only 20 percent

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT
BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME

Source of Support	Received Service			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed Not Rehabilitated		
Own earnings	29.4	38.2	10.7	28.1	28.9
Spouse's earnings	9.0	9.7	7.3	9.2	9.1
Children's earnings	2.5	3.4	0.6	1.3	2.1
Parent's earnings	1.3	0.3	3.4	0.3	0.9
Social Security	16.3	12.9	23.6	20.5	17.8
Pensions	4.5	3.4	6.7	3.3	4.1
Other	2.8	1.8	1.7	2.2	2.0
Welfare Payments	33.2	27.9	45.5	33.4	33.4
No Report	1.7	2.4	0.5	1.7	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	(558)	(380)	(178)	(303)	(861)

were receiving their major source of income from these sources. It should be pointed out that this was the respondents perception of the major sources of support and it does not mean that those who listed other than public assistance payments as major sources of income did not receive some portion of their income from public assistance.

From the various sources of income given in the previous Table, we have calculated per capita income per client. As shown in the Table, the range of total family income from all sources was relatively limited. For the entire sample of 861 the mean or average per capita annual income from all sources was $985. The distribution of income was heavily skewed with 52.2 percent receiving less than $800 per year from all

TABLE 22

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PER CAPITA INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME

Per Capita Income	Received Services			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed Not Rehabilitated		
Nothing	4.8	5.8	2.8	4.3	4.7
100 - 499	22.8	20.6	27.5	29.4	25.1
500 - 799	23.5	23.0	24.7	20.5	22.4
800 - 999	12.6	13.5	10.7	15.2	13.5
1000-1999	27.6	28.5	25.8	23.1	26.0
2000-2999	5.2	5.0	5.6	5.3	5.2
3000-3999	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.2
4000+	1.2	1.3	.7	.2	.9
Mean	1,021	1,057	945	917	985

sources. The distribution by rehabilitation outcome indicates that those receiving services had a mean per capita income of $1,021 as compared to the $917 for those who did not receive services, a difference of $104 per person. For those who did receive services, the total per capita from all sources is greater than for those who did not receive services.

The distribution of per capita income from all sources indicates a very low level of subsistance. For the entire sample, 65.7 percent have a per capita income of less than $1,000 per year, with only 3.1 percent having an income over $3,000. For those who received services, 63.7 percent live on less than $1,000 as compared to 69.4 percent who had not received service. There are some slight differences in percentage receiving less than a $1,000 income by rehabilitation outcome but the

point is very clear that income levels are quite low for this sample.

How dependent are these clients on public assistance payments as a source of income? Table 23 gives the percentage of their per capita income due to earnings. In the entire sample, 55 percent were totally dependent on public assistance, or some other income, as a source of income; 9.3 percent indicated that between 50 and 99 percent of their

TABLE 23

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PER CAPITA INCOME DUE TO EARNINGS BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME

	Received Service			Did Not Receive Service	Total
Percentage	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed Not Rehabilitated		
0	53.8	44.6	73.6	55.8	54.5
1-10	.4	0.0	1.1	.3	0.3
11-50	3.9	3.2	5.6	3.7	3.8
51-80	6.8	7.9	4.5	8.9	7.6
81-99	1.8	2.4	0.6	1.6	1.7
100	33.2	42.0	14.6	29.7	32.0

income was derived from earnings; this leaves some 32 percent or approximately one third who indicated that all of their income came from earnings.

Dependency on public assistance as a source of income decreases for those who received services over those who did not. The least dependent of all groups are those who were successfully rehabilitated. In this group 45 percent were totally dependent on income other than earnings with 42 percent totally independent of public assistance or other sources of income and with 11 percent having at least a 50 percent dependency.

The most dependent group of all was those who were closed not rehabilitated with 74 percent totally dependent on public assistance. The important difference between those closed rehabilitated and the other two groups is the difference in the proportion independent of public assistance as a source of income. This can be summarized by the mean or average percent of total per capita that is earned. For those closed rehabilitated 50.1 percent of the total per capita is earned; 19.5 percent for the closed not rehabilitated and 37.4 percent of total per capita is earned for those not receiving services.

Proportion Per Capita Income Due to Earnings by Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex:

In this section we have broken down the proportion of per capita income due to earnings by both rehabilitation outcome and sex. Since many of the females were housewives, a control by sex would give a clearer picture of the earning of both males and females. As shown in Table 24 closure status is still the main factor with one exception, the closed not rehabilitated group. As has been noted earlier the group closed not rehabilitated are probably the most disadvantaged of the three groups as here again when the category closed not rehabilitated is divided by sex approximately 72 percent of the males are not contributing to their income through earnings. And conversely only 14 percent indicate that they are earning 100 percent of their income. There was little change when we controlled for sex for those who did not receive services in that the proportions remained almost the same, although it should be pointed out that 34 percent of the males who did not receive service were earning 100 percent of their income, though it is also true that 55 percent were earning no part of their income. In summary the analysis by closure status and sex points up only the

TABLE 24

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PER CAPITA DUE TO EARNINGS
BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME AND SEX

	Received Service				Did Not Receive Service	
	Closed Rehabilitated		Closed Not Rehabilitated			
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males
None	51.0	37.0	76.9	71.7	56.5	54.5
1-10	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.9
11-50	3.4	2.9	4.6	6.2	3.1	4.5
51-80	9.2	6.4	3.1	5.3	11.0	5.4
81-99	1.9	2.9	0.0	0.9	2.1	0.9
100+	34.5	50.9	15.4	14.2	27.2	33.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	(206)	(173)	(65)	(113)	(191)	(112)

differences in the closed rehabilitated group where a higher proportion of males than females earned 100 percent of their income and conversely a lower proportion received no income from earnings.

Proportion of Total Per Capita Income Due To Earnings by Rehabilitation Outcome, Sex and Race:

When we control for race and sex, there is a shift in the proportion of earned income. The first major shift is among the females who received services during the joint project. For thosewhite females who were closed rehabilitated, there was an increased proportion 38.3 percent, who earned 100 percent of their income as contrasted to 29.1 percent for the black females although the percentage of those not working is approximately the same. The difference is due to the higher proportion

of black females, 18.7 percent, who indicated they earn a part of their total income, as compared to the white females, 11.6 percent.

TABLE 25

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PER CAPITA INCOME DUE TO EARNINGS FOR THOSE RECEIVING SERVICE BY SEX AND RACE

	Received Services							
	Closed Rehabilitated				Closed Not Rehabilitated			
	Females		Males		Females		Males	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
0	52.3	50.0	32.0	39.0	73.0	82.1	55.2	77.4
1-10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
11-50	3.5	3.3	4.0	2.4	8.1	0.0	20.7	1.2
51-80	14.0	5.8	8.0	5.7	2.7	3.6	6.9	4.8
81-99	1.2	2.5	4.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
100+	29.1	38.3	52.0	50.4	16.2	14.3	17.2	13.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	(86)	(120)	(50)	(123)	(37)	(28)	(29)	(84)

Another shift in proportion of earned income is among the females receiving service, but closed not rehabilitated, where 73 percent of the black females, as contrasted to 82.1 percent of the white females, report they earn no part of their total income. Among the females, the major factor is whether they were rehabilitated or not rehabilitated. This can be seen in the difference between black and white females rehabilitated. The difference between them is less than two percent as compared to nine percent among the females in the closed not rehabilitated category. The difference between closure status for females is twenty-five percent.

Among the males who received services and were closed rehabilitated, the black males had a higher proportion working full-time or earning all of their income and a smaller proportion earning none of their income as compared to the white males. There is a two percent difference in the proportion earning all of their income, 52 percent for the blacks as compared to 50 for the whites, but there is a seven percent difference between black males, 32 percent versus 39 percent, for white males who earned none of their income. Among the males who were closed not rehabilitated, there is a difference by race. In the first place, 77 percent of the white males earn none of their income as contrasted to 55.2 percent of the black males; this difference is not reflected in the proportion earning all of their income where the black male has 17.2 percent as contrasted to 13.1 for the white male. The difference is in the pattern of part-time work where 21 percent of the closed not rehabilitated black males indicated they were earning between 11 and 50 percent of their total income as contrasted to 10 percent of the white males.

Among those who did not receive service, the control for sex and race did not change the proportion of earned income over that revealed by controlling for sex. The pattern that was noted before of the black females having a higher proportion receiving part of their total income from work is present in this group.

There are sufficient differences when we control for sex and race to indicate different patterns of earnings which, although basically related to closure status, do reflect an interaction between sex and race within the various closure statuses.

TABLE 26

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PER CAPITA INCOME DUE TO EARNINGS FOR THOSE NOT RECEIVING SERVICE, BY SEX AND RACE

	Did Not Receive Services			
	Females		Males	
	Black	White	Black	White
None	55.12	59.40	52.73	56.14
1-10	0.00	0.00	1.82	0.00
11-50	3.15	3.12	5.45	3.51
51-80	12.60	7.81	5.45	5.26
81-99	2.40	1.56	1.82	0.00
100+	26.80	28.12	32.73	35.09
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	(127)	(64)	(55)	(57)

CHAPTER VI

INCOME ON LAST OR PRESENT JOB

In this Chapter, work history since closure or rejection will be analyzed and then related to their public assistance history. There were 494 of the 861, or 57.3 percent who had worked since closure or rejection.

The average weekly earnings of those presently working or on last job since closure was $60.02. Again we turn to rehabilitation outcome to see to what extent income differences can be identified with a particular rehabilitation outcome. First, among those who received services, 57.4 percent had worked at some time since closure with an average weekly income of $65.32. Seven out of ten of those who were closed rehabilitated had worked and earned an average weekly wage of $67 as compared to only one out of three of the closed not rehabilitated; they had earned an average weekly income of $57.50.

TABLE 27

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME ON LAST OR PRESENT JOB
BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME

	Received Service			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed Not Rehabilitated		
Average Income	$65.32	$67.04	$57.53	$50.28	$60.02
Proportion in Category Receiving Income	57.4	69.1	32.5	57.4	57.3
Number	320	262	58	174	494

Those who did not receive service in the project compare favorably with those who did in the proportion who had worked, 57.4 percent. But average income was on the average $15 a week less. Here again it is clear that the closed rehabilitated are in the most favorable position, with those who did not receive services next, and those closed not rehabilitated the most disadvantaged.

Here as in the previous Chapter on per capita family income a control for sex is added to further refine the analysis relating to income differentials. There was little difference between females and males in that 463 females in our sample of 861 or 58 percent had worked since closure as compared to 57 percent of the 398 males in our sample. Sex differentials do show up in that the average weekly earnings of 267 females was only $44.60 as compared to the average weekly earnings of $78 for the 227 males. The sex differential does not hold up among those who received service in proportion to the total who had worked. Among the 271 females who received service 55 percent had worked and earned an average weekly income of $48.36 as compared to 60 percent of the males who earned a weekly income of $79.90.

The sex breakdown by closure status for those who receive service shows 77.5 percent of the males rehabilitated had worked and earned an average weekly income of $83 as compared to 62 percent of the females who were closed rehabilitated and who had earned $50.29. As has been observed before the closed not rehabilitated group was more disadvantaged in that 34 percent of the males had worked earning an average weekly wage of $68.87 as compared to 31 percent of females who had earned on the average $36 per week.

TABLE 28

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME ON PRESENT OR LAST JOB
BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME AND SEX

	Received Services						Did Not Receive Service	
	Total		Closed Rehabilitated		Closed Not Rehabilitated			
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Average Income	$48.36	79.91	50.29	83.04	36.00	68.87	40.06	72.40
Proportion In Category Who Had or Was Working	54.6	60.0	62.1	77.5	30.8	33.6	62.3	49.1
Number	148	172	128	134	20	38	119	55

The unexpected finding that an equal proportion of females had worked as males in the total sample is primarily due to those in the sample who did not receive service. Here 62.3 percent of the females had worked or were working with an average weekly income of $40.06 as compared to 49.1 percent of the males who reported a weekly wage of $72.40. For these indicators, the closed rehabilitated group was in the most favorable position at this particular time. Not only were a higher proportion of both males and females employed but their wages as expressed in average weekly wages was higher. Another interesting point is that the wage differential by sex for the total sample was, on the average, $33.43. This held up by sex comparisons in all the rehabilitated groups except those closed rehabilitated. Here, as the income of both males and females went up the difference in wages also went up so that in the closed rehabilitated group the difference between

the average wage by sex is $49.46 favoring the male.

Average Weekly Income On Present or Last Job Controlling For Rehabilitation Outcome, Sex and Race:

Just as controlling for sex helped explain income patterns within closure status, adding a third control, race, addition insight into how many of the clients had worked and their average weekly income will be provided. The comparison will look at those who receive service and compare those closed rehabilitated versus those closed not rehabilitated by sex and race. Among the closed rehabilitated the males have the highest average weekly income. Average income for the white male is $87.26 per week with 77.2 percent who had worked or were working at the time of interview as contrasted to the black male with 78 percent and an average income of $72.77 per week. Among the females who were closed rehabilitated, 76.7 percent of the black females reported an average weekly income of $44.67 on their last or present job as compared to the white females with 51.7 percent reporting an average weekly income of $56.27. The differential among the males by average weekly income is $14.49 favoring the whites, whereas the differential among the females is only $11.60 favoring the whites. Thus sex differential is much greater than the race differential among the closed rehabilitated. The sex differential holds among both blacks and whites in that the differential between black males and females is $28.11 per week favoring the male and among the whites the differential is $30.99. Thus the sex differential in this closure status of rehabilitated is basically one between white males and females rather than for both closure statuses. The one major difference in proportion of clients who had worked is found in the white females where only 51.7 percent reporting as compared to over 75 percent of all others in the closed rehabilitated group.

TABLE 29

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME ON LAST OR PRESENT JOB FOR CLOSED REHABILITATED BY SEX AND RACE

	Females		Males	
	Black	White	Black	White
Average Income	44.67	56.27	72.77	87.26
Proportion in Category Receiving Income	76.7%	51.7%	78.0%	77.2%
Number	66	62	39	95

In viewing those who receive services but were closed not rehabilitated there is a slightly different pattern. First of all, a smaller proportion of this group had worked since closure and secondly, the overall average wage was much less. Among the females, the black females had 35 percent reporting earning with an average weekly income of $33.46 as compared to 25 percent of the white females earning an average weekly income of $40.71. This pattern is consistent with the females in the closed rehabilitated group with the exception of a lower percentage working and a lower average weekly income. Here, as in the closed rehabilitated group, a higher proportion of the black males had worked 37.9 percent as compared to 32.1 percent of the white males.

In the closed not rehabilitated group income differential is more noticeable between males than between females. In the case of the males, the white have an average weekly income of $14.23 more than males as contrasted to a weekly income differential of $7.25 among females. In the closed not rehabilitated category, the differential by sex is less

TABLE 30

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME FROM LAST OR PRESENT JOB
FOR THOSE CLOSED NOT REHABILITATED BY SEX AND RACE

	Female		Male	
	Black	White	Black	White
Average Income	33.46	40.71	44.55	78.78
Proportion in Category Receiving Income	35.1%	25.0%	37.9%	32.1%
Number	13	7	11	27

among the blacks than the whites.

The group who did not receive services is more comparable to the closed rehabilitated group in average weekly income for the males but is much lower in the average weekly income for the females. Also the percentage of each group who have worked is less and falls between the closed rehabilitated and the closed not rehabilitated group. Among the females, the income differential favors the blacks in that their average weekly income is $32.50 as compared to $30.56. Also a higher proportion of the black females, 66.9 percent, had worked as compared to 53.1 percent of the white females. Among the males the average weekly income was not quite as high as among the closed rehabilitated males but on the average was about $10 per week less. In both cases 49 percent of the group had worked since closure or rejection from project. The differential between males by race is approximately $10 favoring the white whereas the differential among the females is $2 favoring the black. The income differential by sex is approximately

TABLE 31

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME ON LAST OR PRESENT JOB
FOR THOSE WHO DID NOT RECEIVE SERVICE BY SEX AND RACE

	Female		Male	
	Black	White	Black	White
Average Income	32.50	30.56	64.33	75.45
Proportion in Category Receiving Income	66.9%	53.1%	49.1%	49.1%
Number	95	43	27	45

$32 for the blacks and approximately $45 for the whites, in both cases favoring the male.

Work History Since Closure or Rejection:

One of the primary goals of the joint program was to provide service and training which would lead toward employment. One index of how successful this aspect of the program was is in the average weeks work since closure or rejection. It should be pointed out that this represents different time periods for different clients in that some who did not participate in the program, those who did not receive service, would have had as much as seven years of work history. On the other hand, those who received services and were closed rehabilitated would probably have only three years. But to standardize this we have, in our questionnaire, asked for work history and converted it to average weeks' worked per year. In addition to the average weeks' work, which indicates the positive benefits of the program, we will carry along, in the analysis, the average weeks on public assistance since

closure or rejection. This will allow us to analyze the benefit along with the dependency on public assistance. It will also provide an indication of the pattern of work and use of public assistance. Although we have reivewed the public assistance history for the entire sample it should be remembered that this analysis covers the 494 clients who had worked or were working at the time of interview. The average weeks worked since closure or rejection was 29 for the entire sample of 494. Supplementing this is the average weeks on public assistance since closure or rejection which was 15.4 weeks. On the average the clients were receiving some income 44 weeks out of the year either earned or from public assistance. The ratio of weeks work to public assistance being almost 2 to 1.

The group who received service had worked, on the average, 30 weeks out of the year. This was supplemented by an average of 13.9 weeks per year on public assistance. Those who received service but were successfully closed rehabilitated worked on the average of 32.1 weeks per year since closure with an average weeks per year on public assistance of 12.8. This produced a ratio of 2.5 weeks work for every one week on public assistance. Among those who received service but were closed not rehabilitated the work history is not as favorable with an average of 22.3 weeks work per year supplemented by 19.3 weeks on public assistance or a ratio of 1.2 weeks for every week on public assistance. The group who did not receive service reported an average

TABLE 32

AVERAGE WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR AND AVERAGE WEEKS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PER YEAR BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME

	Received Services			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	CR	CNR		
Average Weeks Worked	30.3	32.1	22.3	28.1	29.6
Average Weeks On Public Assistance	13.9	12.8	19.3	18.2	15.4
Ratio of Weeks Worked to Weeks on Public Assistance	2.2	2.5	1.2	1.5	1.9

weeks work per year from rejection to interview of 28.1 weeks on the average supplemented by 18.2 weeks on public assistance a ratio of 1.5. The most favorable ratio of weeks work to weeks on public assistance is found among the closed rehabilitated, the next most favorable are those who did not receive any service and the last and most unfavorable group are the closed not rehabilitated. But in all cases where there had been work at the time of interview, they were working more weeks than they were on public assistance. However the intermittent nature of this employment is a part of their work history.

Work History Controlling for Closure Status and Sex:

The sex differential which was found when income was analyzed would suggest a sex differential in work history. In looking at the total sample of 494, the females have worked on the average of 28.5

weeks per year supplemented by 18.5 weeks on public assistance. This represents a ratio of 1.5 weeks worked for every week on public assistance. This is in contrast to the males who worked, on an average, 30.8 weeks per year and supplemented this with 11.8 weeks per year on public assistance. This gives a more favorable ratio of 2.6 weeks worked for every week on public assistance.

TABLE 33

AVERAGE WEEKS WORKED AND AVERAGE WEEKS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PER YEAR BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME AND SEX

	Received Service						Did Not Receive Services	
	Total		CR		CNR			
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Average Weeks Worked Per Year	29.9	30.7	30.1	34.0	28.9	18.8	26.7	31.2
Average Weeks of Public Assistance	15.7	12.4	14.8	10.9	21.9	17.9	21.9	10.0
Ratio of Weeks Worked to Weeks of Public Assistance	1.9	2.5	2.0	3.1	1.3	1.1	1.2	3.1

Among those who are receiving services and were successfully rehabilitated the males worked an average of 34 weeks per year and were on public assistance 10.9 weeks per year, a ratio of 3.1 weeks for every week on public assistance. This is in contrast to the females who indicated they had worked an average of 30.1 weeks per year and were on public assistance 14.8 weeks per year, a ratio of 2.1 weeks work for every week on public assistance.

The females among those receiving services and closed not rehabilitated, indicated a higher average weeks per year working than did males with 28.9 weeks work and 21.9 weeks on public assistance. This represents a ratio of 1.3 weeks work for every week on public assistance. In the case of males that were closed not rehabilitated, they indicated an average work week per year of 18.8 weeks with 17.9 weeks out of the year on public assistance, a ratio of 1.0 weeks work for every week of public assistance. As has been seen in the past analysis, this group represents the most disadvantaged group. It is also interesting to note that among the females who were closed not rehabilitated, they worked, on the average, as much as the total sample but were using public assistance as a supplement more frequently than the average for the entire sample.

The males who did not receive service in the project indicated an average of 31.2 weeks work per year with only 10.1 weeks on public assistance, a ratio of 3.1 weeks work for every week on public assistance. The females, on the other hand, worked an average of 26.7 weeks per year with an average of 21.9 weeks on public assistance, a ratio of 1.2 weeks work for every week on public assistance. In this category the males have one of the better records comparable to the males who were closed rehabilitated.

Work History Controlling for Closure Status, Sex and Race:

By adding the third control, race, additional differentials in work history can be identified. Among those clients receiving service and were successfully rehabilitated, the males worked more on the average than did the females with the black males working, on the average, more weeks per year than any category of closure, sex and race. But even working on the average 37 weeks per year, the black

TABLE 34

AVERAGE WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR AND AVERAGE WEEKS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE BY CLOSURE STATUS, SEX AND RACE

	Receive Service							
	Closed Rehabilitated				Closed Not Rehabilitated			
	Females		Males		Females		Males	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Average Weeks Worked	30.8	29.4	37.2	32.7	30.3	26.4	18.0	19.1
Average Public Assistance	21.9	7.1	13.2	9.9	22.1	15.8	12.1	20.3
Ratio A/B	1.4	4.1	2.8	3.3	1.3	1.7	1.5	.9

males supplemented this with 13.2 weeks on public assistance. Among the females, the largest differential is in average number of weeks on public assistance, where the black females combine 30.8 weeks per year working with 21.9 weeks on public assistance as compared to 29.4 weeks worked, on the average, by white females combined with only 7.1 weeks on public assistance.

The males who were closed not rehabilitated worked less per year than any other category. In addition, the white males supplemented this with 20.3 weeks on public assistance giving them the lowest ratio of average weeks worked to average weeks on public assistance. Among the females who were not rehabilitated, the black males have worked, on the average, more weeks per year than the white females, but have also supplemented this work with 22.1 weeks per year on public assistance. In fact the black females closed rehabilitated have, on the average, 52 weeks of either work or public assistance.

Among those clients who did not receive service in the project the females both black and white worked on the average of 26.7 weeks per year. However, the difference between the two is in the average of number of weeks on public assistance where the black females spent approximately 26.1 weeks as compared to 11.7 weeks for the white female. This provided a ratio of weeks worked per number of weeks on public assistance of approximately one for the black females and for the white females a ratio of 2.3 weeks for every week on public assistance. Among the males the whites worked slightly more on the average than the blacks with an average of 31.6 as compared to 30.7

TABLE 35

AVERAGE WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR AND
AVERAGE WEEKS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR THOSE
NOT RECEIVING SERVICE, BY SEX AND RACE

	Did Not Receive Service			
	Female		Male	
	Black	White	Black	White
Average Weeks Worked	26.7	26.6	30.7	31.6
Average Public Assistance	26.1	11.7	8.6	11.0
Ratio A/B	1.0	2.3	3.6	2.9

weeks for the black males. The major difference here is the difference in average weeks on public assistance which shows the blacks having 8.6 versus 11.0 weeks for the whites. The black male had the best dependency ratio of any with a 3.6 weeks work per every week on public assistance as compared to 2.9 weeks work by the whites for every week on public assistance.

The most favorable ratio of weeks worked to weeks on public assistance is found among the white females who were rehabilitated. The lowest ratio is found among the black females who did not receive any service and the black males who were closed not rehabilitated.

CHAPTER VII

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

In the previous Chapter the work history of clients from closure or rejection to the time of interview was presented. Included in this analysis were those who were working at time of interview; this Chapter deals only with these 322 clients. This represents 37.4 percent of the 861 who were interviewed as compared to the 494 or 57.4 who had had a job or were working at time of interview and were the basis for the previous analysis.

At the time of interview, there were 322 working and earning an average weekly income of $63.04. Following the pattern of analysis used in the previous Chapter, the income of those working at the time of interview will be analyzed by those receiving services and those who did not receive services.

TABLE 36

AVERAGE INCOME AT TIME OF INTERVIEW BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME

	Received Service			Did Not Receive Service	Total
	Total	Closed Rehabilitated	Closed Not Rehabilitated		
Average Income	$70.06	$71.53	$59.96	$55.99	$63.04
Proportion in Category Receiving Income	36.9	47.4	14.6	38.3	37.4
Number	206	180	26	116	322

As indicated in Table 36, there is considerable differential between the average weekly earnings of those who received service and those who did not receive service. The differential in average weekly income between those who received service and those who did not is $14.07. When we divide those who received service into those who were closed rehabilitated and those who were not rehabilitated, the differential is equally great. Those closed rehabilitated reported an average weekly income of $71.53 as compared to $59.96 for those not rehabilitated; this represents a difference of $11.57 per week in earnings. Another major difference is the proportion who were working at time of interview. Among the closed rehabilitated, 47.4 percent reported they were working as compared to only 14.6 percent of those not rehabilitated.

This pattern of earning at time of interview is similar to the work history discussed in the previous Chapter with the exception that average weekly income is higher, but the proportion working in each category is less. It is also clear that the closed rehabilitated client is in a much more favorable position both in terms of the proportion of the group who was working at time of interview and also in terms of the average weekly income. In the closed not rehabilitated, the low percentage who was working reflects the relatively high degree of disability of this group.

Average Weekly Income at Time of Interview By Rehabilitation Outcome and Sex:

Following the lead from the previous Chapter, the clients who were working at the time of interview were classified by sex. The sex differential is quite great in that the females who were working at the

time of interview had an average weekly income of $49.98 as compared to the males with an average weekly income of $80.98. This represents a differential of $31.00 per week. There apparently exists a dual pattern of employment based entirely on sex and for this population at least being a male represents an advantage of 62 percent per week in average weekly income. There is only a slight difference in proportion of each of the sexes who were working at the time of interview with the male having 39.2 percent working as compared with 35.9 percent for the females.

TABLE 37

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME AT TIME OF INTERVIEW BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME AND SEX

	Received Service		Did Not Receive Service		Total	
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males
Average Weekly Income	$52.63	$84.14	$46.68	$72.40	$49.98	$80.98
Proportion in Category Working	33.9%	39.7%	38.7%	37.5%	35.9%	39.2%

The closed not rehabilitated group fare less well than do those closed rehabilitated, but generally fare better than those who did not receive services. Among the males closed not rehabilitated, there were only 21.5 percent who were working at time of interview earning an average weekly income of $75.79 as compared to 18.5 percent of the females who were closed not rehabilitated who were earning $41.50 on the average each week. This differential in terms of earnings represents an average weekly income difference of $34.29 or a percentage differential of 83 percent. This

represents the greatest sex differential by earnings with the females earning 82 percent less per week than the males. In this breakdown of the data by sex and rehabilitation outcome, the sex differential continued to exist and remained between 50 and 55 percent favoring the male with the exception of the closed not rehabilitated group. In this category the sex differential increases to 80 percent favoring the male.

If we compare the sex differential by those who received service and those who did not receive service, it is clear that the differentials still exist and that for the females who received service and were working at time of interview that they were receiving an average weekly income of $52.63 as compared to $84.14 for the males. This represents a difference of $31.51 in average weekly income or 60 percent difference in income due to being a male. This is slightly less than the differential by sex in the total sample. Also, the proportion of males working among those who received service is slightly higher than the total whereas the female proportion is slightly lower. Among those who did not receive service, the differential by sex is less than for the total population or for those who received services.

Included in the group who received services are those who were closed rehabilitated and those who were closed not rehabilitated. The same dual pattern of employment is found here as was in the other analysis. Among those clients closed rehabilitated, the males were earning on the average $85.31 per week as compared to an average weekly earning of $54.30 for the females. This represents a differential of $31.01 per week or a percentage differential of 57 percent favoring the male. The higher proportion of the males working, 57.5 percent, as compared to 39 percent of the females.

TABLE 38

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME AT TIME OF INTERVIEW BY CLOSURE STATUS AND SEX

	Received Services			
	Closed Rehabilitated		Closed Not Rehabilitated	
	Females	Males	Females	Males
Average Weekly Income	$54.30	$85.31	$41.50	$75.79
Proportion in Category Working	38.8%	57.5%	18.5%	21.5%

This 57.5 percent of the males working is the highest proportion working of any group by rehabilitation outcome and also the highest average weekly income. The differential is $25.72 favoring the male. In the group who did not receive services the average weekly income at time of interview was much lower than for those who received service. The males who did not receive service had an average weekly income of $72.40 as compared to the males who received service of $84.14. Among the females who did not receive service they reported an average weekly income of $46.68 as

TABLE 39

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME AT TIME OF INTERVIEW FOR THOSE WHO DID NOT RECEIVE SERVICES BY SEX

	Did Not Receive Services	
	Females	Males
Average Weekly Income	$46.68	$72.40
Proportion in Category Working	38.7%	37.5%

compared to the females who received service of $52.63. The sex differential among those who did not receive service is slightly less than for the total or for those who received service. The differential represents a 55 percent difference. The one reversal of trend in the group

who did not receive service is the fact that the females had a higher proportion, 38.7 percent, working than did the males, 36.5 percent. In fact, the females who did not receive service have a higher proportion than the females who have received service. In general, the sex differential favoring the male holds up for both those clients who received service and those who did not receive service. This differential due to sex is approximately 55 to 60 percent of the female salary. A crucial factor in evaluating the success of this program is the dual pattern of income related to employment. This dual pattern is to a large extent related to a sex differential which places the male at an income advantage of approximately 50 to 60 percent over the females in our sample.

Average Weekly Income At Time of Interview By Rehabilitation Outcome, Sex and Race:

In this section, we add the third control, race, to rehabilitation outcome and sex. Before proceeding with the three variable analysis, we will look at the effect of race on average weekly income. At time of interview, 40.1 percent of the blacks were working reporting an average weekly income of $55.75 as compared to 35.2 percent of the whites reporting an average weekly income of $73.21. This represents a differential of $17.46 average weekly income, or 31.3 percent. It should be noted that a similar analysis controlling for sex indicated a 62 percent differential favoring the males. Following the pattern of the previous analysis under the assumption that sex is a bigger factor than race in the average weekly income earned at time of interview, we will control for rehabilitation outcome, sex and finally race. When we control for sex, the black females who were working at time of interview were earning on the average $47.61 per week as compared to $52.85 for the white females. This represents a differential of $11.24 or 24 percent favoring the white

female. A higher proportion of black females were working at the time of interview (39.6 percent) as compared to 31.6 percent of the white females.

A similar pattern exists among the males in that the white males, who were working at the time of interview, were earning an average weekly income of $86.73 as compared to $70.40 for the black males. This represents a differential of $16.31 favoring the white male or a percentage differential of 23 percent. Here, as among the female, a high proportion of the black males (41 percent) were working at the time of interview and the white males with 38.1 percent. Within each sex category we find a differential income or average weekly earnings of approximately 24 percent favoring the white over the black employee.

When we look at sex and race differentials by those who receive services and those who did not receive services, a similar pattern emerges by sex and race within these two broad categories. Among those who receive services, the black females earned an average weekly income of $46.56 as compared to $57.78 for the white female. This represents a differential of $11.22 or percentage differential of 24 percent. Among the males, the white males who were working at the time of interview had an average weekly income of $88.74 as compared to the black males with an average weekly income of $73.32. This represents a differential of $15.42 per week or percentage-wise 21 percent. Here also the proportion of black females who were working at time of interview, 37 percent, is higher than the proportion of white females, 31 percent. A similar pattern is found among the males by race in that 43 percent of the black males were working at time of interview as compared to 38 percent of the white males.

Among those who did not receive service, 41.7 percent of the black females reported that they were working at time of interview and earning

TABLE 40

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME BY REHABILITATION OUTCOME, SEX AND RACE

	Received Services				Did Not Receive Services			
	Females		Males		Females		Males	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Average Weekly Income	$46.56	$57.78	$73.32	$88.74	$48.51	$42.05	$65.71	$79.09
Proportion in Category Working	37.0	31.1	43.0	38.4	41.7	32.8	38.2	36.8

on the average of $48.51 per week as compared to 32.8 percent of the white females who reported an average weekly income of $42.05. This represents a differential favoring the white female of $6.46 per week or a percentage differential of 15 percent. Among the males, 38.2 percent of the black males who did not receive service reported that they were working at the time of interview with an average weekly income of $65.71 as compared to 36.8 percent of the white males who reported that they were working at time of interview and earning an average weekly income of $79.09. This represents a $13.38 average weekly difference in income favoring the white male or 20 percent differential in salary.

A more detailed analysis of those who received service by closure status reveals a similar dual pattern of average weekly income. In all cases the whites reported a higher average weekly income than did blacks within each closure and sex category.

TABLE 41

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME AT TIME OF INTERVIEW
FOR THOSE WHO RECEIVED SERVICE BY
CLOSURE STATUS, SEX AND RACE

	Closed Rehabilitated				Closed Not Rehabilitated			
	Females		Males		Females		Males	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Average Weekly Income	48.05	58.95	78.03	88.43	39.50	45.50	38.00	90.90[a]
Proportion in Category Working	44.2	35.0	60.0	56.4	21.6	14.3	13.8	11.9

[a]Only four cases in this category.

Summary

In this Chapter we have used two measures as indicators of success of this program: First was the average weekly income of those who were working at time of interview and second was the proportion working at this time. We began with the total sample and added a series of controls; rehabilitation outcome, closure status, sex, and race. This gave us ten sub-groups. Using these two measures, the two most successful sub-groups were the closed rehabilitated black males who at the time of interview had 60 percent of the group working with an average weekly income of $78.03 followed by the closed rehabilitated white males who had 56.4 percent of their group working and reporting an average weekly income of $88.43. The least successful of the groups were the closed not rehabilitated black females who reported only 21.6 percent of the group working earning, on the average, only $39.50 per week and the closed not rehabilitated black males earning, on the average, $38.00 per week and only 13.8 percent working at this time.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study indicate that those disabled public assistance clients who received services from Vocational Rehabilitation, are some years after closure, working more, earning more when they work, and depend less on public assistance than do those who did not receive service. When those clients who received service worked they earned on the average of $65.32 per week as compared to $50.28 for those who did not receive service.

The most direct impact of the program on disabled public assistance clients is seen in the record of those who were closed rehabilitated. They worked on the average of 2.5 weeks for every week on public assistance, and earned on the average $67.04 per week. This represents an increase of 1.3 weeks over those closed not rehabilitated and one week over those who did not receive service. The average weekly earning of the closed rehabilitated group represents an increase of $10.00 per week over the closed not rehabilitated and $15.00 over those who did not receive services.

By comparison with the closed not rehabilitated and those not receiving services, the accomplishments of the closed rehabilitated group are suggestive of the impact that Vocational Rehabilitation has had on returning the client to employment. However, an interpretation of the data suggest areas in which certain modifications and changes would increase the effectiveness of the program. The following recommendations are primarily aimed at implementing the goal of restoration of the client to employment comparable to his ability.

Recommendation 1. That Vocational Rehabilitation place more emphasis on job training. Specifically, the goal of job training should be toward upgrading the skills of the client rather than limited training which places the client at the same level. Without an emphasis on job training, the primary function is one of job placement.

Recommendation 2. That Vocational Rehabilitation redefine their responsibility to the client. The new direction would be toward a continuing responsibility of continuous employment. If the client becomes unemployed after initial placement, Vocational Rehabilitation should assume the responsibility for re-evaluation of the clients skills and potential. If retraining is necessary this should be arranged along with job placement. Specifically it seems that at present initial job placement and employment is a very temporary experience. If the responsibility of Vocational Rehabilitation would extend past initial placement this would minimize the periods of unemployment which now results in reapplying for public assistance.

Recommendation 3. At the point where the client is either physically or vocationally unable to secure meaningful employment they should have some adequate income provided which would allow them to live a life of dignity and self respect.

When in our analysis we controlled for sex and race within rehabilitation outcome, it became clear that there were dual patterns of earnings which were related first to sex and secondly to race. This differential by sex and race was most apparent among those closed rehabilitated. It is also clear that many women are the only support for their family and as such need steady employment.

Recommendation 4. That Vocational Rehabilitation place greater emphasis on the placement of their clients to insure equal opportunity of employment and equal pay independent of sex and race.

Recommendation 5. That Vocational Rehabilitation review their present policies relating to the training and job placement of women; specifically in view of the fact that many women are the only support of the family.